arXiv:1611.03261v1 [math.AP] 10 Nov 2016

Total variation denoising in l^1 anisotropy

Michał Łasica*, Salvador Moll†, Piotr B. Mucha*

*Institute of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, University of Warsaw

Banacha 2, 02-097 Warszawa, Poland

†Departament d'Anàlisi Matemàtica, Universitat de València,

C/Dr. Moliner, 50, Burjassot, Spain

November 11, 2016

Abstract

We aim at constructing solutions to the minimizing problem for the variant of Rudin-Osher-Fatemi denoising model with rectilinear anisotropy

$$TV_{1,\Omega}(u) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|u-u_0\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = \int_\Omega |u_{x_1}| + |u_{x_2}| + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\int_\Omega (u-u_0)^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2$$

in a rectangle Ω, as well as the gradient flow of its underlying anisotropic total variation functional

$$u_t \in -\partial TV_{1,\Omega}(u), \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0.$$

We consider a naturally defined class of functions piecewise constant on rectangles $PCR(\Omega)$ that is strictly dense in $BV(\Omega)$ with anisotropic norm. The main result shows that if given noisy image is a function in $PCR(\Omega)$ then solutions to both considered problems also have this property. For data in $PCR(\Omega)$, the problem of finding the solution is reduced to a finite algorithm. We discuss implications of this result, for instance we use it to prove that continuity is preserved by both considered problems.

MSC 2010: 68U10, 35K67, 35C05, 49N60, 35B65

Keywords: denoising, Rudin-Osher-Fatemi model, total variation flow, anisotropy, rectangles, rectilinear polygons, piecewise constant solutions, regularity, tetris

1 Introduction

In [16], the authors introduced the anisotropic version of the celebrated model by Rudin, Osher and Fatemi (ROF) [24] of total variation based noise removal from a corrupted image. The idea was to substitute the total variation term in the energy functional

$$\int_\Omega |Du| + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\int_\Omega (u_0-u)^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2, \tag{1}$$

by an anisotropic total variation term suitably chosen for a particular given image:

$$\int_\Omega |Du|_\varphi + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\int_\Omega (u_0-u)^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2. \tag{2}$$

Although from the point of view of image processing it is most natural to consider Ω that is a rectangle, in principle it can be any open bounded set with reasonably regular (e. g. Lipschitz) boundary, or the whole plane $\mathbb{R}^2$. The function $|\cdot|_\varphi\colon \mathbb{R}^2 \to [0,+\infty[$ encoding the anisotropy is assumed to be convex, positively 1-homogeneous and such that $|\boldsymbol{x}|_\varphi > 0$ if $\boldsymbol{x} \neq 0$. Observe that (2) is a generalization of (1) for which $|\cdot|_\varphi$ is the Euclidean norm, $|\cdot|$. In this case, the associated Wulff shape,

$$W_\varphi := \{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \colon \boldsymbol{y}\cdot\boldsymbol{x} \leq |\boldsymbol{x}|_\varphi \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2\},$$

is exactly the unit ball with respect to the Euclidean distance. Because of that, minimizers of (1) give rise to convex shapes which are smooth (as is the Euclidean ball). If, instead, $|\cdot|_\varphi$ is a crystalline anisotropy (in the sense that the Wulff shape is a polygon), then minimizers of (2) give rise to convex shapes which are compatible with the Wulff shape, and therefore not smooth anymore.

This new approach has been successfully applied to most of the classical problems in image processing including denoising (see [25],[19] and [20]), cartoon extraction [7], inpainting [12], deblurring [14] or denoising and deblurring of 2-D bar codes [15]. Moreover, in most of these works, the chosen anisotropy is the l^1 norm in the plane; i. e. $|\boldsymbol{x}|_\varphi = |\boldsymbol{x}|_1 := |x_1| + |x_2|$. In this case, the corresponding Wulff shape is the unit ball with respect to the l^∞ distance; i. e. a square.

In the present paper, we focus on the case $|\boldsymbol{x}|_\varphi = |\boldsymbol{x}|_1$. Our purpose is twofold. First of all, we give an explicit expression for the minimizer when the corrupted image u_0 belongs to the class of functions piecewise constant on rectangles (as in the case of applications), denoted (see Section 2.1 for precise definition of this class). Moreover, the minimizer turns out to belong to $PCR(\Omega)$ as well.

In order to obtain such a description of the minimizer, we notice that u is a minimizer of (2) if and only if $\frac{u-u_0}{\lambda}$ belongs to the negative subdifferential of the energy functional $TV_{\varphi,\Omega}$ on $L^2(\Omega)$ defined by

$$TV_{\varphi,\Omega}(u) = \begin{cases} \int_\Omega |Du|_\varphi & \text{if } u \in BV(\Omega), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This anisotropic energy functional was studied in [22] in cases that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ or Ω is a bounded, open, smooth subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, coupled with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The author characterized the subdifferential as the set of elements of form $\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}$ with $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ satisfying suitable conditions (see Theorem 1). In the case that Ω is a rectilinear polygon, for $|\cdot|_\varphi = |\cdot|_1$ and $u_0 \in PCR(\Omega)$, the condition that the solution u to

$$\min_{u\in BV(\Omega)} TV_{1,\Omega}(u) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\int_\Omega (u-u_0)^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \tag{3}$$

also belongs to $PCR(\Omega)$ follows from finding a vector field $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is piecewise constant on rectangles, $|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_i \leq 1$ for $i = 1, 2$ a. e. and a compatibility condition on the jump set of u, $[\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^u] = \mp 1$ $\mathcal{H}^1$-a. e. on J_u is satisfied with a proper choice of signs.

We construct the vector field $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ together with the minimizer u in Theorem 5 by minimizing the L^2 norm of divergence over vector fields compatible with the boundary conditions. Then, in order to show that the divergence is piecewise constant on rectangles, we rely on an auxiliary result (Theorem 3) in which we prove that a certain anisotropic Cheeger-type functional on sets is minimized by a rectilinear polygon. In the proof of that result, an important

point is that, due to the structure of the Cheeger quotient, we can construct approximate minimizers that belong to a finite class of rectilinear polygons subordinate to a grid given by the datum u_0 (we give precise definitions of these notions in Section 2.1). As the set of characteristic functions of rectilinear polygons is not compact with respect to $TV_{1,\Omega}$, this finiteness is essential.

On the other hand, our analysis shows that any function piecewise constant on rectangles belongs the domain of the subdifferential of $TV_{1,\Omega}$, and that this class of functions is preserved by the gradient descent flow of this functional

$$\begin{cases} u_t \in -\partial TV_{1,\Omega}, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

In principle, one could try to deduce this result from Theorem 5 by analyzing the discretization of (4) with respect to time variable (which coincides with a sequence of problems of form (3) with $\lambda = \Delta t$). Instead, in Theorems 6 and 7 we do this directly, constructing the vector field that encodes the solution by means of a number of variational problems. This way we obtain an explicit, finite algorithm for obtaining u, with a different structure than that in Theorem 5. In particular, we exploit semigroup property of solutions to (4). The results in this case say that in any of a finite number of intervals between two subsequent time instances of *merging*, there exists a decomposition of Ω into a finite number of rectilinear polygons such that u_t is constant in each of them. This decomposition and associated values of speed are (again) determined by solving a number of (different) Cheeger-type problems. We stress that the problem of determining evolution is non-trivial, as at time instances of merging, *breaking* may occur along certain line segments, leading to expansion of jump set of the solution.

As $-\partial TV_{1,\Omega}$ is a monotone operator, we know that for any datum $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, if $(u_0)_n \in D(\partial TV_{1,\Omega})$ is a sequence such that $(u_0)_n \to u_0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, then solutions[1] u_n with datum $(u_0)_n$ converge to the solution with datum u_0. Therefore, we do not only give an explicit solution when the initial datum belongs to $PCR(\Omega)$, but we provide an algorithm to compute the solution for any initial corrupted image with the most natural approximation to it (with functions which are in the domain of the subdifferential). Note that clearly functions piecewise constant on rectangles are dense in $L^2(\Omega)$. In fact, more is true, as $PCR(\Omega)$ is strictly dense in $BV(\Omega)$ with norm $\int_\Omega |\nabla u|_1 + \int_\Omega |u| \, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2$, see [8, Theorem 3.4]. The idea of finite dimensional approximation of problem (3) based on PCR functions is already present in literature. For instance, in [17], the authors prove that the solutions to (3) where the functional is replaced with its restrictions to functions piecewise constant on finer and finer grids (and datum u_0 replaced by its suitable projections) converge to the solution to (3). Our result implies that these restricted minimizers are themselves actual solutions to (3) (with projected datum).

Our approach allows us to prove some continuity results about solutions to (3) and (4). In particular, in cases that Ω is a rectangle or the plane, we prove that if the datum u_0 admits a modulus of continuity of certain form, then the solutions do as well (Theorems 10 and 11). Analogous results were obtained in the isotropic case in [10, 11]. The method there involves considering distance between level sets of solution, and the authors first show that the jump set of the solutions is contained (up to a $\mathcal{H}^1$-negligible set) in the jump set of the

[1]Note that both problems (3) and (4) give rise to one parameter families of functions in $BV(\Omega)$ (in one case indexed by λ, in the other — by t). In many cases they in fact coincide, at least for some range of the parameter (see Theorem 12). If we refer to *solutions* without precise context, we mean both solutions to (3) and (4).

initial datum. We point out that such a result is not true in our case since breaking may appear (see Example 2). Very recently, the continuity result for minimizers of (2) in convex domains has been proved to hold in the case of general anisotropies with different methods [21]. We chose to include the continuity results in this paper mainly because the technique used here is very much different — the results are basically corollaries of Lemmata 5 and 6 about non-increasing of maximal jump for PCR solutions, which are interesting on their own. Example 4 shows that continuity is not preserved in general, either by (3) or (4), if Ω is not convex.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we give some notations and preliminaries on rectilinear geometry, BV functions, L^2-divergence vector fields as well as the anisotropic total variation and its gradient descent flow in L^2. In Section 3, we study an auxiliary Cheeger-type problem in rectilinear geometry. Next, in Sections 4 and 5 we give explicit solutions to (3) and (4) in the case that $u_0 \in PCR(\Omega)$, where Ω is a rectilinear polygon. In Section 6, we transfer the results to the case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$. Since the construction of solutions is similar to the previous cases, we only point out the main differences and state the results. Section 7 is devoted to the study of preservation of moduli of continuity. Finally, in Section 8, we show the power of our approach by explicitly computing the solutions for some data, including the effects of bending and creation of singularities. After that we end up with conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

Let us denote by $\mathcal{L}^N$ and $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ the N-dimensional Lebesgue measure and the $(N-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure in $\mathbb{R}^N$, respectively. By $B_\varphi(\boldsymbol{x}, r)$ we denote the ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with respect to norm $|\cdot|_\varphi$, centered at $\boldsymbol{x}$, of radius r. For the ball with respect to the Euclidean norm, we write simply $B(\boldsymbol{x}, r)$.

2.1 Rectilinear polygons

We denote by $\mathcal{R}$ the set of closed rectangles in the plane whose sides are parallel to the coordinate axes, and by $\mathcal{I}$, the set of all horizontal and vertical closed line segments of finite length in the plane.

We call $F \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ a *rectilinear polygon* if $F = \bigcup \mathcal{R}_F$ with a finite $\mathcal{R}_F \subset \mathcal{R}$. We denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the family of all rectilinear polygons.

We call any finite set G of horizontal and vertical lines in the plane a *grid*. If F is a rectilinear polygon, we denote by $G(F)$ the minimal grid such that each side of F is contained in a line belonging to $G(F)$. Given a grid G, we denote

- by $\mathcal{V}(G)$ the set of vertices of G, i. e. the points where any pair of lines in G intersects,
- by $\mathcal{I}(G)$ the set of line segments connecting adjacent vertices in $\mathcal{V}(G)$,
- by $\mathcal{R}(G)$ the set of rectangles whose sides belong to $\mathcal{I}(G)$,
- by $\mathcal{F}(G)$ the set of rectilinear polygons of form $\bigcup \mathcal{R}_F$ with a finite non-empty $\mathcal{R}_F \subset \mathcal{R}(G)$.



Figure 1: An example of a rectilinear polygon F and a grid G. There holds $G = G(F)$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}(G)$.

Note that all of the above are finite sets.

It is also convenient to introduce the following notions of partitions of rectilinear polygons and signatures for their boundaries. Let Ω be a rectilinear polygon. We say that a finite family $\mathcal{Q}$ of rectilinear polygons with disjoint interiors is a partition of Ω if $\Omega = \bigcup \mathcal{Q}$. If G is a grid, we say that a partition $\mathcal{Q}$ of Ω is subordinate to G if $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{F}(G)$. Let F be a rectilinear polygon and let G be a grid. We say that $(\partial F^+, \partial F^-)$ is a signature for ∂F (or for F) if $\partial F^\pm \subset \partial F$ and $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F^+ \cap \partial F^-) = 0$. We say that a signature $(\partial F^+, \partial F^-)$ for ∂F is subordinate to G if there exist disjoint subfamilies $\mathcal{I}_F^\pm \subset \mathcal{I}(G)$ such that $\partial F^\pm = \bigcup \mathcal{I}_F^\pm$. We say that $\mathcal{S}$ is a consistent signature for $\mathcal{Q}$ if $\mathcal{S} = \{(\partial Q^+, \partial Q^-) \colon Q \in \mathcal{Q}\}$, where

- each $(\partial Q^+, \partial Q^-)$ is a signature for ∂Q and
- for each pair $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$, if $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial Q^\pm \cap Q'$ then $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial Q'^\mp$.

We say that a consistent signature $\mathcal{S}$ for $\mathcal{Q}$ is subordinate to G if each $(\partial Q^+, \partial Q^-) \in \mathcal{S}$ is subordinate to G. Given a consistent signature $\mathcal{S}$ for $\mathcal{Q}$, we denote

$$\mathcal{S}^\pm = \bigcup_{(\partial Q^+, \partial Q^-) \in \mathcal{S}} \partial Q^\pm.$$

Now, we give precise definition of the class of functions piecewise constant on rectangles that we will work with. Let Ω be a rectangle and let $w \in BV(\Omega)$. We write $w \in PCR(\Omega)$ if there exists a partition $\mathcal{Q}$ of Ω such that w is constant in the interior of each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. We denote $\mathcal{Q}(w)$ the smallest such partition ($w|_Q \neq w|_{Q'}$ if $Q \neq Q'$, $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}(w)$). Furthermore, we put $G(w) = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}(w)} G(Q)$, $\mathcal{I}(w) = \mathcal{I}(G(w))$, $\mathcal{R}(w) = \mathcal{R}(G(w))$, $\mathcal{F}(w) = \mathcal{F}(G(w))$. Again, these are all finite sets.

Given $w \in PCR(\Omega)$ we define the *signature induced by w in Ω*, $\mathcal{S}(w)$ setting

$$\partial Q^+ = \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial Q \colon \boldsymbol{x} \in Q' \in \mathcal{Q}(w), w|_{Q'} < w|_Q\}$$

$$\partial Q^- = \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial Q \colon \boldsymbol{x} \in Q' \in \mathcal{Q}(w), w|_{Q'} > w|_Q\},$$

for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(w)$. The signature induced by w in Ω is a consistent signature for $\mathcal{Q}(w)$ subordinate to $G(w)$.

2.2 Functions of bounded variation

A function $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ whose partial derivatives in the sense of distributions are Radon measures with finite total variation in Ω is called a *function of bounded variation*. This class of functions is denoted by $BV(\Omega)$. For $u \in BV(\Omega)$, the gradient Du is a vector-valued Radon measure with finite total variation

$$|Du|(\Omega) := \sup \left\{ \int_\Omega u \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\eta} \, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \ : \ \boldsymbol{\eta} \in C_c^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) \,, \ |\boldsymbol{\eta}| \leq 1 \text{ in } \Omega \right\},$$

and the space $BV(\Omega)$ is endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{BV(\Omega)} := \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + |Du|(\Omega) \,.$$

Moreover, Du can be decomposed into its absolutely continuous and singular parts,

$$Du = \nabla u \mathcal{L}^N + D^s u \,,$$

∇u being the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the measure Du with respect to the Lebesgue measure $\mathcal{L}^N$. The singular part, $D^s u$, can be split into two parts: the *jump* part $D^j u$ and the Cantor part $D^c u$. We denote by S_u the set of all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$ such that $\boldsymbol{x}$ is not a Lebesgue point of u. A point $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$ is an *approximate jump point of* u if there exist $u^+(\boldsymbol{x}) \neq u^-(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_u(\boldsymbol{x}) \in S^{N-1}$ such that

$$\lim_{r\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^N(B^+(\boldsymbol{x}, r, \boldsymbol{\nu}_u(\boldsymbol{x})))} \int_{B^+(\boldsymbol{x},r,\boldsymbol{\nu}_u(\boldsymbol{x}))} |u(\boldsymbol{y}) - u^+(\boldsymbol{x})| \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y} = 0 \,,$$
$$\lim_{r\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^N(B_r^-(\boldsymbol{x}, r, \boldsymbol{\nu}_u(\boldsymbol{x})))} \int_{B_r^-(\boldsymbol{x},r,\boldsymbol{\nu}_u(\boldsymbol{x}))} |u(\boldsymbol{y}) - u^-(\boldsymbol{x})| \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y} = 0 \,,$$

where

$$B^+(\boldsymbol{x}, r, \boldsymbol{\nu}_u(\boldsymbol{x})) = \{\boldsymbol{y} \in B(\boldsymbol{x}, r) \ : \ (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_u(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0\} \,,$$
$$B^-(\boldsymbol{x}, r, \boldsymbol{\nu}_u(\boldsymbol{x})) = \{\boldsymbol{y} \in B(\boldsymbol{x}, r) \ : \ (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_u(\boldsymbol{x}) < 0\} \,.$$

We denote by J_u the set of approximate jump points of u. Then J_u is a Borel subset of S_u, $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(S_u \setminus J_u) = 0$,

$$D^j u = D^s u \llcorner J_u \ \text{ and } \ D^c u = D^s u \llcorner (\Omega \setminus S_u) \,.$$

Moreover, it is well known that

$$D^j u = (u^+ - u^-) \boldsymbol{\nu}_u \, \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner J_u$$

and for $\boldsymbol{x} \in J_u$ there holds $\boldsymbol{\nu}_u(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{Du}{|Du|}(\boldsymbol{x})$, where $\frac{Du}{|Du|}$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of Du with respect to its total variation $|Du|$. If $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a Lebesgue point of u, then $u^+(\boldsymbol{x}) = u^-(\boldsymbol{x})$ for any choice of the normal vector and we say that $\boldsymbol{x}$ is an approximate continuity point of u. We define the approximate limit of u by $\tilde{u}(\boldsymbol{x}) = u^+(\boldsymbol{x}) = u^-(\boldsymbol{x})$.

Given an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ and a Lebesgue measurable subset E of $\mathbb{R}^N$, we say that E has finite perimeter in Ω if $\chi_E \in BV(\Omega)$ and we write $P(E, \Omega) := |D\chi_E|(\Omega)$. If E has finite perimeter in $\mathbb{R}^N$, we write $P(E) := P(E, \mathbb{R}^N)$.

We say that a point $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ belongs to the reduced boundary $\partial^* E$ of a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ if $|D\chi_E|(B(\boldsymbol{x}, \varrho)) > 0$ for all $\varrho > 0$ and the quantity $\frac{D\chi_E(B(\boldsymbol{x},\varrho))}{|D\chi_E|(B(\boldsymbol{x},\varrho))}$ has a limit that belongs to $\mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ as $\varrho \to 0^+$. If these conditions hold, we denote this limit by $\boldsymbol{\nu}^E(\boldsymbol{x})$. There holds

$$\partial^* E \subset \partial^{\frac{1}{2}} E = \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \lim_{\varrho \to 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(B(\boldsymbol{x}, \varrho) \cap E)}{\mathcal{L}^N(B(\boldsymbol{x}, \varrho))} = \frac{1}{2} \right\},$$

also $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}\left(\partial^{\frac{1}{2}} E \setminus \partial^* E\right) = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$-almost every point in $\mathbb{R}^N$ is either a Lebesgue point for χ_E or belongs to $\partial^* E$.

2.3 Pairings between BV functions and L^2-divergence vector fields.

We recall here the results we need from theory of pairings between L^2-divergence fields and BV functions started in [2] (see also [13]). We consider the space

$$X_\Omega = \left\{ \boldsymbol{z} \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) \ : \ \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z} \in L^2(\Omega) \right\} . \tag{5}$$

For every $\boldsymbol{z} \in X_\Omega$ and $w \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^2(\Omega)$, let $(\boldsymbol{z}, Dw) : C_c^\infty(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ be the functional defined by setting

$$\langle (\boldsymbol{z}, Dw)\,,\, \rho \rangle := -\int_\Omega w\, \rho \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}\, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^N - \int_\Omega w\, \boldsymbol{z} \cdot \nabla \rho\, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^N \qquad (\rho \in C_c^\infty(\Omega))\,. \tag{6}$$

Then it can be seen that $(\boldsymbol{z}, Dw)$ is a Radon measure in Ω,

$$|(\boldsymbol{z}, Dw)(B)| \le |(\boldsymbol{z}, Dw)|(B) \le \|\boldsymbol{z}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} |Dw|(B) \tag{7}$$

for every Borel set $B \subseteq \Omega$. Moreover, $(\boldsymbol{z}, Dw)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $|Dw|$, with Radon Nikodym derivative $\theta(\boldsymbol{z}, Dw, \boldsymbol{x})$. There holds

$$\theta(\boldsymbol{z}, Dw, \boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{z}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \frac{Dw}{|Dw|}(\boldsymbol{x}) \quad |\nabla w| - \text{a.e. in } \Omega. \tag{8}$$

In [2, Theorem 1.2], the weak trace on the boundary of a bounded Lipschitz domain Ω of the normal component of $\boldsymbol{z} \in X_\Omega$ is defined. Namely, it is proved that there exists a linear operator $[\cdot, \boldsymbol{\nu}] : X_\Omega \to L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ such that $\| [\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\nu}] \|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} \le \|\boldsymbol{z}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ for all $\boldsymbol{z} \in X_\Omega$ and $[\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\nu}]$ coincides with the pointwise trace of the normal component if $\boldsymbol{z}$ is smooth:

$$[\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\nu}](\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{z}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}(\boldsymbol{x}) \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\Omega \ \text{ if } \boldsymbol{z} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^N).$$

2.4 The anisotropic total variation. The anisotropic perimeter.

We recall here the notion of anisotropic total variation introduced in [1]. Given an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$, a norm $|\cdot|_\varphi$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$, and a function $u \in L^2(\Omega)$, we define

$$TV_{\varphi,\Omega}(u) := \sup \left\{ \int_\Omega u \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\eta}\, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^N : \boldsymbol{\eta} \in C_c^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N),\ |\boldsymbol{\eta}|_\varphi^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \le 1 \right\}$$

where $|\cdot|_\varphi^*$ denotes the dual norm associated with $|\cdot|_\varphi$. This is a proper, lower semicontinuous functional on $L^2(\Omega)$ with values in $[0, \infty]$. We have $TV_{\varphi,\Omega}(u) < +\infty$ iff $u \in BV(\Omega)$, in which case we use notation $|Du|_\varphi(\Omega) = TV_{\varphi,\Omega}(u)$. This is an equivalent seminorm on $BV(\Omega)$.

In the analysis of differential equations associated with the functional $TV_{\varphi,\Omega}$, a crucial role is played by the following result characterizing the subdifferential of $TV_{\varphi,\Omega}$ (an expected generalization of [22, Theorem 12.]).

Theorem 1. *Let $w \in \mathcal{D}(TV_{\varphi,\Omega}) = BV(\Omega)$. There holds $v \in -\partial TV_{\varphi,\Omega}(w)$ iff $v \in L^2(\Omega)$ and there exists $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $v = \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi}$ and*

$$-\int_\Omega w \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi} = \int_\Omega |Dw|_\varphi, \quad |\cdot|_\varphi^*(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \le 1 \ \text{ a. e. in } \Omega, \quad \left[\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^\Omega\right] = 0 \ \mathcal{H}^1 - \text{a. e. on } \partial\Omega. \tag{9}$$

We denote by $X_{\varphi,\Omega}(w)$ the set of $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^2(\Omega)$ satisfying (9).

In the present paper, we are concerned with the case $\varphi = |\cdot|_1$. In particular, we have

$$|Du|_1(\Omega) = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|_1\, dx + \int_\Omega \left| \frac{Du}{|Du|} \right|_1 d|D^s u|$$

for each $u \in BV(\Omega)$. Given a set of finite perimeter E in Ω (resp. in $\mathbb{R}^N$) we denote $P_1(E,\Omega) = |D\chi_E|_1(\Omega)$ and $P_1(E) = P_1(E,\mathbb{R}^N)$. If E has finite perimeter in Ω, then

$$P_1(E,\Omega) = \int_{\partial^* E \cap \Omega} |\nu^E|_1 \, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^1. \tag{10}$$

If ∂E is Lipschitz, we can drop the star in $\partial^* E$. In that case, ν^E is the pointwise $\mathcal{H}^1$-a. e. defined outer Euclidean normal to E.

Given $\lambda > 0$, a rectangle Ω and $u_0 \in BV(\Omega)$ we consider the minimization problem (3). The problem has a unique solution, which is also the unique solution to the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$u = u_0 + \lambda \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}, \tag{11}$$

where $\boldsymbol{z} \in X_{1,\Omega}(u)$.

The following result is an easy corollary of Theorem 1 for the case of PCR functions.

Lemma 1. *Let Ω be a rectangle and $w \in PCR(\Omega)$. Then, any vector field $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^\infty(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that, for any $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(w)$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}|_Q \in X_Q$ satisfies*

$$|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty \le 1 \text{ a. e.}, \qquad [\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^Q]\big|_{\partial Q^\pm} = \mp 1, \qquad [\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^Q]\big|_{\partial Q \cap \partial\Omega} = 0.$$

belongs to $X_{1,\Omega}(w)$.

2.5 Anisotropic total variation flows

Another class of natural differential equations associated with the functional $TV_{\varphi,\Omega}$ are anisotropic total variation flows that formally correspond to Neumann problems

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \operatorname{div} \partial|\cdot|_\varphi(\nabla u) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \left[\partial|\cdot|_\varphi(\nabla u), \boldsymbol{\nu}^\Omega\right] = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\nu}^\Omega$ denoting the outer unit normal to $\partial\Omega$. In our case, $\varphi = 1$. Let us recall the notion of *(strong) solution* to a general φ-anisotropic total variation flow, which is an adaptation of [22, Definition 4.] for bounded domain Ω.

Definition 1. *Let $0 \le T_0 < T_* \le \infty$. A function $u \in C([T_0,T_*[, L^2(\Omega))$ is called a strong solution to (12) in $[T_0,T_*[$ if $u \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(T_0,T_*,L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^1_w(]T_0,T_*[,BV(\Omega))$ and there exists $\boldsymbol{z} \in L^\infty(]T_0,T_*[\times\Omega,\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that*

$$u_t = \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(]T_0,T_*[\times\Omega), \tag{13}$$

$$|\boldsymbol{z}|^*_\varphi \le 1 \quad \text{a. e. in }]T_0,T_*[\times\Omega, \tag{14}$$

$$[\boldsymbol{z}(t), \boldsymbol{\nu}^\Omega] = 0 \quad \mathcal{H}^1 - \text{a. e. in } \partial\Omega \text{ and} \tag{15}$$

$$\int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{z}, Du) = \int_\Omega |Du(t,\cdot)|_\varphi \quad \text{for a. e. } t \in]T_0,T_*[. \tag{16}$$

It can be proved as in [22, Theorem 11.] that, given any $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $0 \leq T_0 < T_* \leq \infty$, there exists a unique strong solution u to (12) in $[T_0, T_*[$ with $u(T_0, \cdot) = u_0$. Clearly, if $0 \leq T_0 < T_1 < T_2 \leq \infty$ and

$$u \in C([T_0, T_2[, L^2(\Omega)) \cap W^{1,2}_{loc}(T_0, T_*, L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^1_w(]T_0, T_*[, BV(\Omega))$$

is such that $u|_{[T_0,T_1[}$ a strong solution to (12) in $[T_0, T_1[$ and $u|_{[T_1,T_2[}$ a strong solution to (12) in $[T_1, T_2[$ then u is a strong solution to (12) in $[T_0, T_2[$.

In fact, this existential result is a characterization of the Hille-Yosida semigroup generated by the negative subdifferential of $TV_{\varphi,\Omega}$. In the present paper we are concerned with evolution of regular (with respect to the operator $-\partial TV_{\varphi,\Omega}$) initial data. In such case, semigroup theory yields following result [3, Chapter III].

Theorem 2. *Let $u_0 \in \mathcal{D}(\partial TV_{\varphi,\Omega})$ and let u be the strong solution to (12) in $[0, \infty[$ starting with u_0. Then, every $\boldsymbol{z} \in L^\infty(]0, \infty[\times\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying (13-16) has a representative (denoted henceforth $\boldsymbol{z}$) such that*

(1) in every $t \in [0, \infty[$, $\boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot)$ minimizes

$$\mathcal{F}_\Omega(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \int_\Omega (\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi})^2 \, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^N$$

in $X_{\varphi,\Omega}(u(t, \cdot))$ and this condition uniquely defines $\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot)$,

(2) the function

$$[0, \infty[\ni t \mapsto \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot) \in L^2(\Omega) \quad \text{is right-continuous,}$$

(3) the function

$$[0, \infty[\ni t \mapsto \|\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{is non-increasing,}$$

(4) the function $[0, \infty[\ni t \mapsto u(t, \cdot) \in L^2(\Omega)$ is right-differentiable and

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}^+ u(t, \cdot) = \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot) \quad \text{in every } t \in [0, \infty[.$$

3 Cheeger problems in rectilinear geometry

Let Ω be a rectilinear polygon and let $f \in PCR(\Omega)$. We denote $G = G(f)$. Let $F_0 \subset \Omega$ be a rectilinear polygon in $\mathcal{F}(G)$, let $(\partial F_0^+, \partial F_0^-)$ be a signature for ∂F_0 subordinate to G. We have

$$f = \mu_1 \chi_{E_1} + \ldots + \mu_n \chi_{E_n} \tag{17}$$

with a sequence of real numbers μ_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $\mu_i \neq \mu_j$ if $i \neq j$ and a sequence of pairwise disjoint rectilinear polygons $E_i \in \mathcal{F}(G)$, $i = 1, \ldots j$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = \Omega$. We denote $\hat{\mu} = \max_{i=1,\ldots,n} |\mu_i|$.

We introduce a functional $\mathcal{J}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}$ with values in $]-\infty, +\infty]$ defined on subsets of F_0 of positive area given by

$$\mathcal{J}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}(E) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(E)} \left(P_1(E, \operatorname{int} F_0) + \mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E \cap \partial F_0^+) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E \cap \partial F_0^-) - \int_E f \, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \right)$$

if E has finite perimeter and $\mathcal{J}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}(E) = +\infty$ otherwise. Note that for each measurable $E \subset F_0$ of positive area and finite perimeter, we have

$$\mathcal{J}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}(E) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(E)} \left(P_1(E) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E \setminus \partial F_0^+) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E \cap \partial F_0^-) - \int_E f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \right).$$

Lemma 2. *Let $E \subset F_0$ be a set of finite perimeter with $\mathcal{L}^2(E) > 0$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a rectilinear polygon $F \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ such that*

$$\mathcal{J}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}(F) < \mathcal{J}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}(E) + \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Throughout the proof, we denote for short $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}$.

Step 1. Smoothing
First, given $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain a smooth closed set $\widetilde{E} \subset F$ such that $\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{E}) \le \mathcal{J}(E) + \varepsilon$ and $\widetilde{E}$ does not contain any vertices of F_0. For this purpose, we adapt the standard method of smooth approximation of sets of finite perimeter. Namely, we consider superlevels of smooth functions $\psi_\delta * \chi_E$, $\delta > 0$. Here, ψ_δ is a standard smooth approximation of unity. Using Sard's lemma on regular values of smooth functions and the coarea formula for anisotropic total variation [1, Remark 4.4], we obtain, reasoning as in the proof of [18, Theorem 1.24], a number $0 < t < \frac{1}{2}$ and a sequence $\delta_j \to 0^+$ such that

$$\widetilde{E}_j = \{\psi_{\delta_j} * \chi_E \ge t\}$$

is a smooth set for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots$ and

$$\mathcal{L}^2(\widetilde{E}_j \triangle E) \to 0, \qquad \liminf_{j\to\infty} P_1(\widetilde{E}_j) = P_1(E),$$
$$\mathcal{H}^1((\partial^* E) \setminus \widetilde{E}_j) \to 0, \qquad \left| \int_{\widetilde{E}_j} f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 - \int_E f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \right| \to 0. \quad (18)$$

The first two items in (18) are covered explicitly in [18]. The last one is clear taking into account (17). It remains to justify the third item. Since $\partial^* E \subset \partial^{\frac{1}{2}} E$, for each $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^* E$ there is a natural number j_0 such that for every $j > j_0$ there holds $\boldsymbol{x} \in \widetilde{E}_j$. Thus, as $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E) = P(E)$ is finite, the assertion follows by continuity of measures.

Now, as $\widetilde{E}_j$ are smooth, $\partial(F_0 \cap \widetilde{E}_j)$ are piecewise smooth curves and all items in (18) remain true if we substitute $F_0 \cap \widetilde{E}_j$ for $\widetilde{E}_j$. Therefore, for any given $\varepsilon' > 0$ we choose a number j such that

$$\mathcal{L}^2(F_0 \cap \widetilde{E}_j) > \mathcal{L}^2(E) - \varepsilon', \qquad P_1(F_0 \cap \widetilde{E}_j) < P_1(E) + \varepsilon',$$
$$\mathcal{H}^1(\partial(\widetilde{E}_j \cap F) \setminus \partial F_0^+) > \mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E \setminus \partial F_0^+) - \varepsilon'$$
$$\text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^1(\partial(\widetilde{E}_j \cap F) \cap \partial F_0^-) > \mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E \cap \partial F_0^-) - \varepsilon'. \quad (19)$$

Taking ε' small enough we obtain

$$\mathcal{J}(F_0 \cap \widetilde{E}_j) < \mathcal{J}(E) + \varepsilon. \quad (20)$$

There is at most a finite number of points where the piecewise smooth curve $\partial(F \cap \widetilde{E}_j)$ is not infinitely differentiable. Thus, we can clearly smooth out the set $F \cap \widetilde{E}_j$ in such a way that

(19), and consequently (20), still hold. We denote the resulting set $\widetilde{E}$. We demand $\widetilde{E}$ does not contain any vertices of F_0.

Step 2. Squaring
Let now $\varepsilon'' > 0$. For each $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\widetilde{E}$ there is an open square $U(\boldsymbol{x}) = I(\boldsymbol{x}) \times J(\boldsymbol{x})$ of side smaller than ε'' such that $\widetilde{E} \cap U(\boldsymbol{x})$ coincides with subgraph of a smooth function $g\colon I(\boldsymbol{x}) \to J(\boldsymbol{x})$ or $g\colon J(\boldsymbol{x}) \to I(\boldsymbol{x})$ and that $U(\boldsymbol{x})$ intersects at most one edge of F_0 (contained in the supergraph of g). The family $\{U(\boldsymbol{x})\colon \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\widetilde{E}\}$ is an open cover of $\partial\widetilde{E}$. We can extract a finite cover $\{U_1, \dots, U_l\}$, $l = l(\varepsilon'')$ out of it. We assume that $\{U_1, \dots, U_l\}$ is minimal in the sense that none of its proper subsets covers $\partial\widetilde{E}$. Let us take $\widehat{E}_0 = \widetilde{E} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} W_i$, where we have denoted by W_i the smallest closed rectangle containing $U_i \cap \widetilde{E}$. The operation of taking a union of $\widetilde{E}$ with W_1 increases volume while not increasing l^1-perimeter. Indeed, denoting $U_1 =]a_1, b_1[\times]a_2, b_2[$ and assuming without loss of generality that $\widetilde{E} \cap U_1$ coincides with the subgraph of a smooth function $g_1\colon]a_1, b_1[\to]a_2, b_2[$, we have

$$\int_{W_1 \cap \partial\widetilde{E}} |\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\widetilde{E}}|_1 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^1 = \int_{]a_1,b_1[} 1 + |g_1'| \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^1 \geq |\sup g_1 - g_1(a_1)| + |b_1 - a_1| + |\sup g_1 - g_1(b_1)|$$

and consequently

$$P_1(\widetilde{E}) = \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widetilde{E} \setminus W_1) + \int_{W_1 \cap \partial\widetilde{E}} |\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\widetilde{E}}|_1 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^1 \geq P_1(\widetilde{E} \cup W_1).$$

Similarly we show that taking the union of $\widetilde{E} \cup W_1$ with W_2 does not increase the perimeter, and so on. Furthermore, clearly $\partial\widehat{E}_0 \setminus \partial F_0^+ \subset \partial\widetilde{E}_0 \setminus \partial F_0^+$ and $\partial\widehat{E}_0 \cap \partial F_0^- \subset \partial\widetilde{E}_0 \cap \partial F_0^-$. Summing up, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{L}^2(\widehat{E}_0) \geq \mathcal{L}^2(\widetilde{E}), \qquad P_1(\widehat{E}_0) \leq P_1(\widetilde{E}), \qquad \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widehat{E}_0 \setminus \partial F_0^+) \geq \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widetilde{E} \setminus \partial F_0^+), \\ &\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widehat{E}_0 \cap \partial F_0^-) \geq \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widetilde{E} \cap \partial F_0^-), \qquad \left| \int_{\widehat{E}_0} f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 - \int_{\widetilde{E}} f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \right| \leq 2\hat{\mu} \cdot l(\varepsilon'') \cdot (\varepsilon'')^2. \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

For small enough ε'' no point $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$ is included in more than two of $U_1, \dots, U_l$, and so

$$l(\varepsilon'') \cdot (\varepsilon'')^2 \leq 2\mathcal{L}^2(\{\boldsymbol{x}\colon \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \partial\widetilde{E}) \leq \varepsilon''\}) \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon'' \to 0$. Thus, fixing small enough ε'', $\mathcal{J}(\widehat{E}_0) < \mathcal{J}(E) + \varepsilon$ holds.

Step 3. Aligning
Next, take any edge I of $\widehat{E}_0$ that is not contained in G. We assume for clarity that $I = [a_1, b_1] \times \{y_0\}$ is horizontal. We denote by R_- (resp. R_+) the minimal rectangle in $\mathcal{F}(G(u_0) \cup G(\widehat{E}_0))$ contained in $\widehat{E}_0$ (resp. $\overline{F_0 \setminus \widehat{E}_0}$) that has I as one of its sides. Furthermore, we denote $R_- \cup R_+ = [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2]$. Note that due to the assumption on I, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, $E_i \cap (R_- \cup R_+) = [a_1^i, b_1^i] \times [a_2, b_2]$. For $y \in [a_2, b_2]$, we define

$$\overline{\mathcal{J}}(y) = \mathcal{J}(\widehat{E}_0 \setminus R_- \cup [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, y]). \quad (22)$$

Further, we denote $p = P_1(\widehat{E}_0) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widehat{E}_0 \setminus \partial F_0^+) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widehat{E}_0 \cap \partial F_0^-)$ and $A = \mathcal{L}^2(\widehat{E}_0)$. For $y \in]a_2, b_2[$, $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ takes the form

$$\overline{\mathcal{J}}(y) = \frac{p + c(y - y_0) - \int_{\widehat{E}_0} u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 - \sum_{i=1,\dots,n} \mu_i (b_1^i - a_1^i)(y - y_0)}{A + (b_1 - a_1)(y - y_0)}. \quad (23)$$

This is a homography and hence monotone. The number $c \in \{-2, -1, 0, 1, 2\}$ depends on how many vertical edges of $R_- \cup R_+$ are contained in $\partial\widehat{E}_0 \setminus R_-$ or $\partial F_0^{\pm}$. $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ might be discontinuous at the endpoints of its domain. This is only possible in two (possibly overlapping) cases:

(A) $R_- = \widehat{E}_0$ or

(B) as y attains b_i, $i = 1, 2$, a pair of edges of $\widehat{E}_0 \setminus R_- \cup [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, y]$ vanishes or an edge touches the boundary of F_0.

In case (A), the limit of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}(y)$ as y tends to a_2^+ is $+\infty$ and therefore $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ is decreasing. In case (B), the one-sided limit $\lim_{y \to b_i} \overline{\mathcal{J}}(y) > \overline{\mathcal{J}}(b_i)$. Thus, whether $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ is continuous or not, either $\mathcal{J}(\widehat{E}_0 \cup R_+)$ or $\mathcal{J}\left(\overline{\widehat{E}_0 \setminus R_-}\right)$ is not larger than $\mathcal{J}(\widehat{E}_0)$. In accordance with that, we denote either $\widehat{E}_1 = \widehat{E}_0 \cup R_+$ or $\widehat{E}_1 = \overline{\widehat{E}_0 \setminus R_-}$ and perform the same argument with $\widehat{E}_1$ instead of $\widehat{E}_0$. Provided that we decide, for instance, that whenever $\mathcal{J}(\widehat{E}_0 \cup R_+) = \mathcal{J}\left(\overline{\widehat{E}_0 \setminus R_-}\right)$ we choose $\widehat{E}_1 = \widehat{E}_0 \cup R_+$ (this way we avoid getting stuck in a loop), this procedure terminates in a finite number i of steps and we obtain $F = \widehat{E}_i$ whose all edges are contained in G. □



(a) A BV set E. (b) Smoothed set $\widetilde{E}$. (c) Squared set $\widehat{E}_0$. (d) Aligned set F.

Figure 2: The construction in Lemma 2 applied to an example set of finite perimeter contained in a rectilinear polygon (in case $f = 0$).

Theorem 3. *The functional $\mathcal{J}_{F_0, \partial F_0^+, \partial F_0^-, f}$ is bounded from below and is minimized by a rectilinear polygon $F \subset F_0$ such that $F \in \mathcal{F}(G)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{J}_{F_0, \partial F_0^+, \partial F_0^-, f}(E_n) \to -\infty$. Then, due to Lemma 2 there exist rectilinear polygons $F_n \subset F_0$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ such that $F_n \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ and $\mathcal{J}_{F_0, \partial F_0^+, \partial F_0^-, f}(F_n) \to -\infty$, an impossibility.

Now, consider any minimizing sequence (E_n) of $\mathcal{J}_{F_0, \partial F_0^+, \partial F_0^-, f}$. By means of Lemma 2 we find a minimizing sequence of rectilinear polygons $F_n \in F_0$ such that $F \in \mathcal{F}(G)$. As the set of such rectilinear polygons is finite, (F_n) has a constant subsequence $(F_{n_k}) \equiv (F)$. Clearly, F minimizes $\mathcal{J}_{F_0, \partial F_0^+, \partial F_0^-, f}$. □

Instead of $\mathcal{J}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}$ we can consider

$$\check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}(E)\colon \{E\subset F_0 \text{ — measurable s. t. } \mathcal{L}^2(E)>0\}\to[-\infty,+\infty[$$

defined by

$$\check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}(E)=\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(E)}\left(-P_1(E,\operatorname{int}F_0)+\mathcal{H}^1(\partial^*E\cap\partial F_0^+)-\mathcal{H}^1(\partial^*E\cap\partial F_0^-)-\int_E f\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2\right)$$

if E has finite perimeter and $-\infty$ otherwise. Then, noticing that $\check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}=-\mathcal{J}_{F_0,\partial F_0^-,\partial F_0^+,-f}$ we obtain analogous versions of Lemma 2 and Theorem 3.

Lemma 3. *Let $E\subset F_0$ be a set of finite perimeter with $\mathcal{L}^2(E)>0$. Then for every $\varepsilon>0$ there exists a rectilinear polygon $F\in\mathcal{F}(G)$ such that*

$$\check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}(F)>\check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}(E)-\varepsilon.$$

Theorem 4. *The functional $\check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_0,\partial F_0^+,\partial F_0^-,f}$ is bounded from above and is maximized by a rectilinear polygon $F\subset F_0$ such that $F\in\mathcal{F}(G)$.*

4 The minimization problem for TV_1 with PCR datum

Let Ω be a rectilinear polygon, let u_0 belong to $PCR(\Omega)$, and denote $G=G(u_0)$. Given $\lambda>0$, we use Lemma 3 to prove that the solution to the problem (3) is encoded in the partition $\{F_1,\dots,F_l\}$ of Ω and consistent signature $\{(\partial F_1^+,\partial F_1^-),\dots,(\partial F_l^+,\partial F_l^-)\}$ for $\{F_1,\dots,F_l\}$, both subordinate to G, produced by the following algorithm:

- First, denote by F_1 the minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_{\Omega,\emptyset,\emptyset,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}$, and put $\partial F_1^+=\partial F_1\setminus\partial\Omega$, $\partial F_1^-=\emptyset$.
- At k-th step, denote $\check{F}_k=\bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1}F_i$. If $\Omega=\check{F}_k$, stop. Otherwise, denote by F_k the largest (in the sense of inclusion) minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_{\Omega\setminus\check{F}_k,\emptyset,\partial\check{F}_k,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}$ and put $\partial F_k^+=\partial F_k\setminus(\partial\Omega\cup\partial\check{F}_k)$, $\partial F_k^-=\partial F_k\cap\partial\check{F}_k$.

Theorem 5. *Let $\{F_1,\dots,F_l\}$, $\{(\partial F_1^+,\partial F_1^-),\dots,(\partial F_l^+,\partial F_l^-)\}$ be the partition of Ω and signature produced by the algorithm above. Let $u\in PCR(\Omega)$ be given by*

$$u|_{F_k}=\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_k)}\left(\int_{F_k}u_0\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2-\lambda(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_k^+)-\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_k^-))\right)\tag{24}$$

for $k=1,\dots,l$. Then u is the solution to (3)*. Furthermore, $Q(u)=\{F_1,\dots,F_l\}$, $\mathcal{S}(u)=\{(\partial F_1^+,\partial F_1^-),\dots,(\partial F_l^+,\partial F_l^-)\}$.*

Proof. Let us fix $k=1,\dots,l$. We now adapt the reasoning in the proof of Theorem 5 in [4]. We consider the functional $\mathcal{F}_k$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_k(\boldsymbol{\xi})=\int_{F_k}\left(\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}+\frac{u_0}{\lambda}\right)^2\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2$$

on the set of vector fields $\boldsymbol{\eta}\in X_{F_k}$ satisfying

$$|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_\infty\le 1 \text{ a. e.},\qquad [\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\nu}^{F_k}]\big|_{\partial F_k^\pm}=\mp1,\qquad [\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\nu}^{F_k}]\big|_{\partial F_k\cap\partial\Omega}=0.$$

We first prove that any vector field $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$, such that $\boldsymbol{\xi}|_{F_k}$ satisfies above conditions for each $k = 1, \dots, l$, belongs to $X_{1,\Omega}(u)$, with u defined by (24). This follows immediately by Lemma 1 once we know that the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_{j+1})}\left(\int_{F_{j+1}} u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 - \lambda(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_{j+1} \setminus (\partial\Omega \cup \partial\check{F}_{j+1})) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_{j+1} \cap \partial\check{F}_{j+1}))\right) &= u|_{F_{j+1}} \\ < u|_{F_j} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_j)}\left(\int_{F_j} u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 - \lambda(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_j \setminus (\partial\Omega \cup \partial\check{F}_j)) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_j \cap \partial\check{F}_j))\right), &\quad (25)\end{aligned}$$

is satisfied for $j = 1, \dots, k-1$ with u defined in (24). Note that we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_{j+1} \cap \partial\check{F}_j) = \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_{j+1} \cap \partial\check{F}_{j+1}) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_{j+1} \cap \partial F_j) \\ &\qquad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_{j+1} \setminus (\partial\Omega \cup \check{F}_j)) = \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_{j+1} \setminus (\partial\Omega \cup \check{F}_{j+1})) + \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_{j+1} \cap \partial F_j).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, were (25) not the case, we would have (using the inequality $\frac{x_1+x_2}{y_1+y_2} \le \frac{x_1}{y_1}$ that holds whenever $\frac{x_2}{y_2} \le \frac{x_1}{y_1}$ for positive numbers x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2),

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{J}_{\Omega\setminus\check{F}_j,\emptyset,\partial\check{F}_j,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(F_j \cup F_{j+1}) \\ &\quad\le \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_j) + \mathcal{L}^2(F_{j+1})}\left(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_j \cap \partial\check{F}_j) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_j \setminus (\partial\Omega \cup \partial\check{F}_j)) - \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{F_j} u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2\right. \\ &\qquad\left. + \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_{j+1} \cap \partial\check{F}_{j+1}) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_{j+1} \setminus (\partial\Omega \cup \partial\check{F}_{j+1})) - \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{F_{j+1}} u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2\right) \\ &\qquad\le \mathcal{J}_{\Omega\setminus\check{F}_j,\emptyset,\partial\check{F}_j,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(F_j), \quad (26)\end{aligned}$$

in contradiction with the choice of F_j.

Proceeding as in [5, Proposition 6.1], we see that $\mathcal{F}_k$ attains a minimum and for any two minimizers $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \boldsymbol{\eta}_2$ we have $\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 = \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\eta}_2$ a. e. in F_k. Let us take any minimizer and denote it $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{F_k}$. Arguing as in [5, Theorem 6.7] and [6, Theorem 5.3], $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{F_k} \in L^\infty(F_k) \cap BV(F_k)$. Let $\nu = \mathcal{J}_{F_k,\partial F_k^+,\partial F_k^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(F_k)$. As F_k is the minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_{\Omega\setminus\check{F}_k,\emptyset,\partial\check{F}_k,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}$, it follows from the definition of $\partial F_k^\pm$ that ν is the minimal value of $\mathcal{J}_{F_k,\partial F_k^+,\partial F_k^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}$. We have

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_k)}\int_{F_k}\left(\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{F_k} + \frac{u_0}{\lambda}\right)\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 = -\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_k)}\left(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_k^+) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_k^-) - \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{F_k} u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2\right) = -\nu.$$

Were $\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{F_k} + \frac{u_0}{\lambda}$ not constant in F_k, there would exist $\mu < \nu$ such that

$$A_\mu = \left\{\boldsymbol{x} \in F_k\colon\ -\left(\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{F_k}(\boldsymbol{x}) + \frac{u_0}{\lambda}\right) < \mu\right\}$$

has positive measure and finite perimeter. Employing [6, Proposition 3.5],

$$\begin{aligned}-\nu < -\mu &< \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(A_\mu)}\int_{A_\mu}\left(\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{F_k} + \frac{u_0}{\lambda}\right)\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(A_\mu)}\left(P_1(A_\mu, F_k) + \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_k^+ \cap \partial^* A_\mu) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_k^- \cap \partial^* A_\mu) - \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{F_k} u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2\right) \\ &= -\mathcal{J}_{F_k,\partial F_k^+,\partial F_k^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(A_\mu),\end{aligned}$$

which would contradict that F_k minimizes $\mathcal{J}_{F_k,\partial F_k^+,\partial F_k^-}$, hence $u_0+\lambda\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{F_k}$ is constant in F_k and therefore equal to its mean value:

$$u_0+\lambda\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{F_k}=\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_k)}\left(\int_{F_k}u_0\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2-\lambda(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_k^+)-\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_k^-))\right)=u,$$

i. e. u satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation (11).

The last sentence of the assertion follows from (25). □

5 The TV_1 flow with PCR initial datum

In what now follows, we are concerned with the identification of the evolution of initial datum $w\in PCR(\Omega)$, with Ω a rectilinear polygon, under the l^1-anisotropic total variation flow (4). Note that in such case we have

$$Dw=D^jw=-\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}(w)}w|_{\operatorname{int}Q}\,\boldsymbol{\nu}^Q\,\mathcal{H}^1\llcorner\partial Q.$$

In particular, the condition $-\int_\Omega w\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2=\int_\Omega|Dw|_1$ for a vector field $\boldsymbol{\xi}\in L^\infty(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^2)$ appearing in the definition of $X_{1,\Omega}$ is equivalent to $\left[\boldsymbol{\xi},\boldsymbol{\nu}^Q\right]=\mp1$ in $\partial Q^\pm$ for all $Q\in\mathcal{Q}(w)$ and corresponding $(\partial Q^+,\partial Q^-)\in\mathcal{S}(w)$. The result below determines the initial evolution for (4), prescribing possible breaking of initial facets.

Theorem 6. *Let $w\in PCR(\Omega)$ and let G be any grid such that $\mathcal{Q}(w)$ is subordinate to G. Then, there exists a field $\boldsymbol{\eta}\in X_{1,\Omega}(w)$ and, for each $Q\in\mathcal{Q}(w)$, a partition $\mathcal{T}_Q$ of Q and a consistent signature $\mathcal{S}_Q$ for $\mathcal{T}_Q$ subordinate to G such that*

(1) for each $F\in\mathcal{T}_Q$, $Q\in\mathcal{Q}(w,\Omega)$,

$$\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\eta}=-\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F)}\left(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F^+)-\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F^-)\right)\ \text{in } F,$$

(2) $\mathcal{T}=\bigcup_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}(w)}\mathcal{T}_Q$ is a partition of Ω subordinate to G, $\mathcal{S}=\bigcup_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}(w)}\mathcal{S}_Q$ is a consistent signature for $\mathcal{T}$ subordinate to G,

(3) $\mathcal{S}(w)^\pm\subset\mathcal{S}^\pm$,

(4) for each $(\partial F^+,\partial F^-)\in\mathcal{S}_Q$, $Q\in\mathcal{Q}(w)$,

$$[\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\nu}^F]\big|_{\partial F^\pm}=\mp1.$$

Proof. We fix $Q\in\mathcal{Q}(w)$ and produce the partition $\mathcal{T}_Q$ of Q and consistent signature $\mathcal{S}_Q$ for $\mathcal{T}_Q$ by means of an inductive procedure analogous to the one in Section 4. First, by virtue of Theorem 3, the functional $\mathcal{J}_{Q,\partial Q^+,\partial Q^-,0}$ attains its minimum value λ on a rectilinear polygon $F_1\in\mathcal{F}(G)$. We define

$$\partial F_1^-=\partial Q^-\cap\partial F_1\quad\text{and}\quad\partial F_1^+=(\partial F_1\cap\partial Q^+)\cup(\partial F_1\setminus\partial Q).$$

Next, in k-th step, we put $\check{F}_k=\bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1}F_j$. If $\check{F}_k=Q$ we stop and put $\mathcal{T}_Q=\{F_1,\dots,F_{k-1}\}$, $\mathcal{S}_Q=\{(\partial F_1^+,\partial F_1^-),\dots,(\partial F_{k-1}^+,\partial F_{k-1}^-)\}$. Otherwise we define F_k as any minimizer of

$$\mathcal{J}_{Q\setminus\check{F}_k,\partial Q^+,\partial Q^-\cup\partial\check{F}_k,0},$$

and

$$\partial F_k^- = \partial F_k \cap \left(\partial Q^- \cup \partial \check{F}_k\right),$$
$$\partial F_k^+ = (\partial F_k \cap \partial Q^+) \cup \left(\partial F_j \setminus \left(\partial Q \cup \partial \check{F}_k\right)\right).$$

Now, for each $F_k \in \mathcal{T}_Q$, we define $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{F_k}$ as any minimizer of the functional $\mathcal{F}_k$ defined on the set of vector fields $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^\infty(F_k, \mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying

$$\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi} \in L^2(F_k), \qquad |\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty \le 1 \text{ a. e.}, \qquad [\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^{F_k}]\big|_{\partial F_k^\pm} = \mp 1, \qquad \left[\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^{F_k}\right]\big|_{\partial F_k \cap \partial\Omega} = 0$$

by $\mathcal{F}_k(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \int_{F_k} (\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi})^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2$. As in the proof of Theorem 5, we prove that $\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{F_k}$ is constant in each $F_k \in T_Q$.

Next, we repeat the procedure for the rest of $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(w)$ and define $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ by $\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{F_k} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_{F_k}$ for every $F_k \in \mathcal{T}_Q$, $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(w)$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in X_{1,\Omega}(w)$.

□

Remark. Instead of considering at each step the minimization problem for $\mathcal{J}_{Q,\partial Q^+,\partial Q^-,0}$, one can consider maximization problem for $\check{\mathcal{J}}_{Q,\partial Q^+,\partial Q^-,0}$ (see Theorem 3′).

Theorem 7. *Let $u_0 \in PCR(\Omega)$ and denote $G = G(u_0)$. Let u be the global strong solution to (4). Then there exist a finite sequence of time instances $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_n$, partitions $\mathcal{Q}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{Q}_{n-1}$ of Ω and consistent signatures $\mathcal{S}_k$ for Q_k subordinate to G, $k = 0, \ldots, n-1$, such that*

$$u_t = -\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F)} \left(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F^+) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F^-)\right) \quad \text{in }]t_k, t_{k+1}[\times \operatorname{int} F \quad \text{for each } F \in \mathcal{Q}_k, \tag{27}$$

$k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$ and $u(t,\cdot) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega)} \int_\Omega u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2$ for $t \ge t_n$. In particular, $u(t,\cdot) \in PCR(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(u(t,\cdot))$ is subordinate to G for all $t > 0$. Furthermore,

$$t_n \le \frac{\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega)}{\min_{F \subsetneq \Omega, F \in \mathcal{F}(G)} P_1(F, \Omega)} \cdot \max \left| u_0 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega)} \int_\Omega u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \right|. \tag{28}$$

Proof. We proceed inductively, starting with $j = 0$. Suppose we have proved that there exist time instances $0 = t_0 < \ldots < t_j$, partitions $\mathcal{Q}_k$ of Ω and consistent signatures $\mathcal{S}_k$ for Q_k subordinate to G, $k = 0, \ldots, j-1$, such that (27) holds for $k = 1, \ldots, j$ (for $j = 0$ this assumption is vacuously satisfied). This implies that $u(t,\cdot) \in PCR(\Omega)$ and $Q(u(t,\cdot))$ is subordinate to G for $t \in [0, t_j]$. Let $\mathcal{Q}_j = \mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{S}_j = \mathcal{S}$, $\boldsymbol{z}_j = \boldsymbol{\eta}$, where $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{S}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ are the partition of Ω, the consistent signature for $\mathcal{T}$ subordinate to G and the vector field defined in Theorem 6 given $w = u(t_j,\cdot)$. For $T > 0$ let us define a function $\widetilde{u}_j \in C([t_j, T[, BV(\Omega))$ by

$$\widetilde{u}_{j,t}(t,\cdot) = \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}_j \text{ for } t \in]t_j, T[,$$
$$\widetilde{u}_j(t_j,\cdot) = u(t_j,\cdot).$$

Clearly, pair $(\widetilde{u}_j, \boldsymbol{z}_j)$ satisfies regularity conditions as well as (13, 14) from Definition 1. Let choose $T = t_{j+1}$ as the first time instance $t > t_j$ such that

$$\widetilde{u}_j(t,\cdot)|_{\operatorname{int} F} = \widetilde{u}_j(t,\cdot)|_{\operatorname{int} F'},$$

where $F, F' \in \mathcal{Q}_j$, $F \ne F'$, $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F \cap \partial F') > 0$; i. e. the first moment of merging of facets after time t_j.

Due to condition (4) of Theorem 6, one can show, similarly as in the proof of Theorem 5, that condition (16) of Definition 1 is satisfied for $(\widetilde{u}_j, \boldsymbol{z}_j)$ and $\widetilde{u}_j$ is the solution to (12) with initial datum $u(t_j, \cdot)$ in $[t_j, t_{j+1}[$. Then, due to continuity, u is necessarily equal to $\widetilde{u}_j$ in $[t_j, t_{j+1}]$, in particular, for $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]$, $u(t, \cdot) \in PCR(\Omega)$ and $Q(u(t, \cdot))$ is subordinate to G. This completes the proof of the induction step.

Now, let us prove that this procedure terminates after a finite number of steps. For this purpose, we rely on Theorem 2. In fact, we prove that there exists a constant $\gamma = \gamma(G) > 0$ such that at each t_j, $j > 0$ the non-increasing function $t \mapsto \|\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ has a jump of size at least γ.

First, we argue that $\|\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t_j, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \|\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ for each $t \in [t_{j-1}, t_j[$ (in this interval $\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}$ is a constant function of time). We will reason by contradiction. If $\|\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t_j, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \|\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t_{j-1}, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, then $\boldsymbol{z}(t_{j-1}, \cdot)$ is a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}_\Omega$ in $X_{1,\Omega}(u(t_j, \cdot))$ and consequently $\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t_{j-1}, \cdot) = \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t_j, \cdot) = \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot)$ for $t \in [t_{j-1}, t_{j+1}[$ (see Theorem 2). The minimization problem for $\mathcal{F}_\Omega$ in $X_{1,\Omega}(u(t_j, \cdot))$ is equivalent to minimization of functionals $\mathcal{F}_Q$ defined by $\mathcal{F}_Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \int_{F_Q} (\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 \, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2$ on the set of vector fields $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in L^\infty(Q, \mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying

$$\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\eta} \in L^2(Q), \qquad |\boldsymbol{\eta}|_\infty \le 1 \text{ a. e.}, \qquad [\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^Q]\big|_{\partial Q^\pm} = \mp 1, \qquad [\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^Q]\big|_{\partial Q \cap \partial \Omega} = 0$$

separately for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(u(t_j, \cdot))$, $(\partial Q^+, \partial Q^+) \in \mathcal{S}(u(t_j, \cdot))$. Let us take $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(u(t_j, \cdot))$ such that there exist F_1, F_2 in $\mathcal{Q}_{j-1}$, $F_1 \neq F_2$, $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_1 \cap \partial F_2) > 0$, with $F_1, F_2 \subset Q$. Denote by $\mathcal{Q}_{j-1,Q}$ the maximal subset of $\mathcal{Q}_{j-1}$ with the properties

- F_1, F_2 belong to $\mathcal{Q}_{j-1,Q}$,
- if F belongs to $\mathcal{Q}_{j-1}$ then $F \subset Q$,
- if F belongs to $\mathcal{Q}_{j-1,Q}$ then there exists $F' \in \mathcal{Q}_{j-1,Q}$, $F' \neq F$ with $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F \cap \partial F') \neq 0$.

Let now F_0 be a minimizer of $u_t|_{]t_{j-1}, t_{j+1}[\times F} = \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}|_{]t_{j-1}, t_{j+1}[\times F}$ among $F \in \mathcal{Q}_{j-1,Q}$. Then, due to (16) and the way Du changes after the moment of merging, we necessarily have

$$[\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^{F_0}]\big|_{]t_j, t_{j+1}[\times \partial F_0^- \cup (\partial F_0^+ \setminus \partial Q)} = +1.$$

Due to the choice of F_0, $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_0^+ \setminus \partial Q) > 0$, hence

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_0)} \int_{F_0} \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z} \, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \Big|_{[t_j, t_{j+1}[} > \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_0)} \int_{F_0} \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z} \, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \Big|_{[t_{j-1}, t_j[},$$

a desired contradiction.

Next, we observe that there is only a finite set of values, depending only on G, that $\|\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ can achieve. Indeed, for all $t \ge 0$, $\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot)$ is the unique result of minimization problems for $\mathcal{F}_Q$ with $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(u(t_j, \cdot))$, $(\partial Q^+, \partial Q^-) \in \mathcal{S}(u_{t_j}, \Omega)$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots$. Each $\mathcal{Q}(u(t_j, \cdot))$ is a partition of Ω subordinate to G, each $\mathcal{S}(u(t_j, \cdot))$ is a consistent signature for $\mathcal{Q}(u(t_j, \cdot))$ subordinate to G. There is only a finite number of these.

It remains to prove the estimate on t_n. In any time instance $t \ge 0$ the maximum (minimum) value of $u(t, \cdot)$ is attained in a rectilinear polygon $F_+(t)$ ($F_-(t)$). In all but a finite number of t we have

$$\mp u_t(t, \cdot)|_{F_\pm(t)} = \mp \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}(t, \cdot)|_{F_\pm(t)} = \pm \frac{P_1(F_\pm(t), \Omega)}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_\pm(t))} \ge \frac{\min_{F \subsetneq \Omega, F \in \mathcal{F}(G)} P_1(F, \Omega)}{\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega)},$$

unless $F^+ = F^- = \Omega$. Furthermore, testing the equation (12) with χ_Ω we obtain $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_\Omega u(t,\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 = 0$ in a. e. $t \geq 0$ and, due to continuity of the semigroup in L^2,

$$\frac{1}{|\Omega|}\int_\Omega u(t,\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 = \frac{1}{|\Omega|}\int_\Omega u_0\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2$$

in all $t > 0$. This concludes the proof. □

6 The case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$

In this section we transfer previous results to the case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$. First, we note that all the definitions and theorems in subsections 2.4 and 2.5 carry over without change (the Neumann boundary condition becomes void) to this case (see [22]). As for the definitions in subsections 2.1, it turns out that the statements of our results transfer nicely to the case of the whole plane if we allow for certain *unbounded rectilinear polygons*. Accordingly, in this section a subset $F \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ will be called a rectilinear polygon if either

- $F = \bigcup \mathcal{R}_F$ with a finite $\mathcal{R}_F \subset \mathcal{R}$ (in which case we say that F is a bounded rectilinear polygon)
- or $F = \overline{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{R}_F}$ with a finite $\mathcal{R}_F \subset \mathcal{R}$ (in which case we say that F is an unbounded rectilinear polygon).

Next, we restrict ourselves to non-negative compactly supported initial data. We say that a non-negative compactly supported function $w \in BV(\mathbb{R}^2)$ belongs to $PCR_+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ if there exists a partition $\mathcal{Q}$ of $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that w is constant in the interior of each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Note that any such $\mathcal{Q}$ contains exactly one unbounded set Q_0 and $w|_{\operatorname{int} Q_0} = 0$.

The essential difficulty in obtaining results analogous to Theorems 5 and 7 lies in dealing with unbounded sets that one expects to be produced by a suitable version of the algorithm in Section 4. For this purpose, we need the following

Lemma 4. *Let $f \in PCR_+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and let F be an unbounded rectilinear polygon. Then, there exists a vector field $\boldsymbol{\xi}_F \in X_F$ such that*

$$|\boldsymbol{\xi}_F|_\infty \leq 1, \quad \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_F + f = \text{const. a. e. in } F \qquad \text{and } [\boldsymbol{\xi}_F, \boldsymbol{\nu}^F] = 1 \quad \mathcal{H}^1\text{-a. e. in } \partial F \tag{29}$$

if and only if

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E \cap \partial F) + \int_E f\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \leq P_1(E, \operatorname{int} F) \tag{30}$$

for all $E \subset F$ bounded of finite perimeter. Moreover, in this case $\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_F + f = 0$ in F for any vector field $\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_F$ satisfying (29).

This is a version of [4, Theorem 5 and Lemma 6] where analogous statement is proved for isotropic perimeter in case $f = 0$. The idea of the proof is to consider auxiliary problem in a large enough ball. The proof of Lemma 4 follows along similar lines, however we decided to put it here, also because it seems that there is a small gap in the proof of [4, Theorem 5] that we patch. Namely the first inequality in line 12, page 511 of [4] (corresponding to (35) here) does not seem to be satisfied in general.

Proof. It is easy to see that if $\boldsymbol{\xi}_F$ satisfies (29) then $\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_F + f = 0$ in F (see [4, Lemma 6]). Thus, if a vector field $\boldsymbol{\xi}_F \in X_F$ satisfies (29), then we have for any bounded set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of finite perimeter

$$0 = \int_E \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_F + f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \geq \mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E \cap \partial F) + \int_E f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 - P_1(E, \operatorname{int} F).$$

Now assume that (30) holds. Let us take $R > 0$ large enough that

$$2\mathrm{dist}(\partial B_\infty(R), \partial F \cup \operatorname{supp} f) \geq \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F) + \int_F f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2. \tag{31}$$

Put $c(R) = -\frac{\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F) + \int_F f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2}{\mathcal{H}^1(\partial B_\infty(R))}$. Denote by $\boldsymbol{\xi}_R$ the minimizer of functional $\mathcal{F}$ defined by $\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \int_{F\cap B_\infty(R)} (\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\eta} + f)^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2$ on the set of vector fields $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in X_{F\cap B_\infty(R)}$ satisfying

$$|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_\infty \leq 1 \text{ in } F \cap B_\infty(R) \qquad [\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^F] = 1 \text{ in } \partial F, \qquad [\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^{B_\infty(R)}] = c(R) \text{ in } \partial B_\infty(R)$$

almost everywhere with respect to natural choice of measures. If $\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_R + f$ is constant in $F \cap B_\infty(R)$ then, due to choice of $c(R)$, $\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_R + f \equiv 0$ in $F \cap B_\infty(R)$. Supposing that the opposite is true, we obtain, as in the proof of Theorem 5, that there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$Q_\lambda = \{\boldsymbol{x} \in F \cap B_\infty(R) \colon \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\xi}_R + f > \lambda\}$$

is a set of positive measure and finite perimeter, and we have

$$-P_1(Q_\lambda, \operatorname{int} F \cap B_\infty(R)) + \mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* Q_\lambda \cap \partial F) + \int_{Q_\lambda} f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 + c(R)\mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* Q_\lambda \cap \partial B_\infty(R)) \geq \lambda \mathcal{L}^2(Q_\lambda) > 0 \tag{32}$$

which can be rewritten as

$$-P_1(Q_\lambda) + 2\mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* Q_\lambda \cap \partial F) + \int_{Q_\lambda} f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 + (1 + c(R))\mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* Q_\lambda \cap \partial B_\infty(R)) > 0. \tag{33}$$

Assumption (31) implies that $c(R) > -1$, so we approximate Q_λ with a closed smooth set as in the proof of Lemma 2 in such a way that (33) still holds. Due to additivity of left hand side of (33), there is a connected component $\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$ of this smooth set that also satisfies (33), or equivalently

$$-P_1(\widetilde{Q}_\lambda, \operatorname{int} F \cap B_\infty(R)) + \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widetilde{Q}_\lambda \cap \partial F) + \int_{\widetilde{Q}_\lambda} f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 + c(R)\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\widetilde{Q}_\lambda \cap \partial B_\infty(R)) > 0. \tag{34}$$

If $\partial\widetilde{Q}_\lambda \cap \partial B_\infty(R) = \emptyset$, (34) contradicts (30). On the other hand, if $\partial\widetilde{Q}_\lambda \cap (\partial F \cup \operatorname{supp} f) = \emptyset$, (34) itself is a contradiction. Taking these observations into account, there necessarily holds

$$P_1(\widetilde{Q}_\lambda, \operatorname{int} F \cap B_\infty(R)) \geq 2\mathrm{dist}(\partial B_\infty(R), \partial F \cup \operatorname{supp} f) \tag{35}$$

whence (31) yields a contradiction, *unless* $\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$ is not simply connected in such a way that there is a connected component Γ of $\partial\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$ such that

- $\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$ is inside of Γ (Γ is the exterior boundary of $\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$),

- Γ does not intersect $\partial F \cup \operatorname{supp} f$,
- and Γ intersects all four sides of $B_\infty(R)$.

In this case, let us denote as $\widehat{Q}_\lambda$ the union of $\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$ and the region between Γ and $\partial B_\infty(R)$. We have $\int_{\Gamma \setminus \partial B_\infty(R)} |\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\widetilde{Q}_\lambda}|_1 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^1 \geq \mathcal{H}^1(B_\infty(R) \setminus \Gamma)$ and consequently (as $-c(R) < 1$)

$$P_1(\widetilde{Q}_\lambda, \operatorname{int} F \cap B_\infty(R)) - c(R)\mathcal{H}^1(\partial \widetilde{Q}_\lambda \cap \partial B_\infty(R)) \geq P_1(\widehat{Q}_\lambda, \operatorname{int} F \cap B_\infty(R)) \\ - c(R)\mathcal{H}^1(\partial \widehat{Q}_\lambda \cap \partial B_\infty(R)) = P_1(\widehat{Q}_\lambda, \operatorname{int} F \cap B_\infty(R)) + \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F) + \int_F f \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2,$$

a contradiction with (34) which implies that $\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\xi}_R \equiv 0$. Now, we define $\boldsymbol{\xi}_F \in X_F$ by

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_F(x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\xi}_R(x_1, x_2) & \text{in } F \cap B_\infty(R), \\ (c(R)\operatorname{sgn} x_1, 0) & \text{in } \{|x_1| > R, |x_2| < R\} \\ (0, c(R)\operatorname{sgn} x_2) & \text{in } \{|x_1| < R, |x_2| > R\} \\ (0,0) & \text{in } \{|x_1| > R, |x_2| > R\}. \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

□

Now given $\lambda > 0$, $u_0 \in PCR_+(\mathbb{R}^2)$, grid $G = G(f)$, and an unbounded rectilinear polygon F subordinate to G with signature $(\partial F^+, \partial F^-) = (\emptyset, \partial F)$, let us denote by R_0 the smallest rectangle containing the support of u_0 (clearly R_0 is subordinate to G and $\partial F \subset R_0$). Next, let us take a set of finite perimeter $E \subset F$ such that $\mathcal{J}_{F,\partial F^+,\partial F^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(E) < 0$. Then there holds $\mathcal{J}_{F,\partial F^+,\partial F^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(E) \leq \mathcal{J}_{F,\partial F^+,\partial F^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(R_0 \cap E)$. Indeed, we only need to argue that $P_1(R_0 \cap E) \leq P_1(E)$, which follows easily by approximation of E with smooth sets. This way, we obtain the following alternative:

- either $\mathcal{J}_{F,\partial F^+,\partial F^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}$ is minimized by a bounded rectilinear polygon subordinate to G,
- or $P_1(E, \operatorname{int} F) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E \cap \partial F) - \int_E \frac{u_0}{\lambda} \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \geq 0$ for each $E \subset F$ of finite perimeter.

By virtue of Lemma 4, in the second case there exists a vector field $\boldsymbol{\xi}_F \in X_F$ such that (29) is satisfied. Supplementing the proof of Theorem 5 with this reasoning we obtain

Theorem 8. *Let $\{F_1, \ldots, F_l\}$, $\{(\partial F_1^+, \partial F_1^-), \ldots, (\partial F_l^+, \partial F_l^-)\}$ be the partition of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and signature produced by the algorithm in Section 4. Let $u \in PCR_+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be given by*

$$u|_{F_k} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F_k)} \left(\int_{F_k} u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 - \lambda(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_k^+) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F_k^-)) \right) \tag{37}$$

for $k = 1, \ldots, l$. Then u is the solution to (3) with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$. Furthermore, $Q(u) = \{F_1, \ldots, F_l\}$, $\mathcal{S}(u) = \{(\partial F_1^+, \partial F_1^-), \ldots, (\partial F_l^+, \partial F_l^-)\}$.

and, by similar modifications in Section 5,

Theorem 9. *Let $u_0 \in PCR_+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and denote $G = G(u_0)$. Let u be the global strong solution to (4). Then there exist a finite sequence of time instances $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_n$, partitions*

$\mathcal{Q}_0, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_{n-1}$ *of* $\mathbb{R}^2$ *and consistent signatures* $\mathcal{S}_k$ *for* Q_k *subordinate to* G, $k = 0, \dots, n-1$, *such that*

$$u_t = -\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(F)} \left(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial F^+) - \mathcal{H}^1(\partial F^-) \right) \quad \text{in }]t_k, t_{k+1}[\times \operatorname{int} F \quad \text{for each } F \in \mathcal{Q}_k, \tag{38}$$

$k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ *and* $u(t, \cdot) = 0$ *for* $t \geq t_n$. *In particular,* $u(t, \cdot) \in PCR+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *and* $\mathcal{Q}(u(t, \cdot))$ *is subordinate to* G *for all* $t > 0$. *Furthermore,*

$$t_n \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}^2(R_0)}{P_1(R_0)} \cdot \max u_0, \tag{39}$$

where we denoted by R_0 *the minimal rectangle containing the support of* u_0.

Proof. Let us only mention that the particularly simple form of bound (39) on t_n compared to (28) is due to the fact that R_0 clearly minimizes $\frac{P_1(F, \mathbb{R}^2)}{\mathcal{L}^2(F)}$ among bounded rectilinear polygons subordinate to G. □

7 Preservation of continuity in rectangles

We start with a lemma concerning PCR functions on a rectangle, which says, roughly speaking, that the maximal oscillation on horizontal (or vertical) lines, on any given length scale, is not increased by the solution to (3) with respect to initial datum $u_0 \in PCR(\Omega)$. To make a precise statement, we fix a rectangle Ω and let G be any grid such that Ω is subordinate to G. Further, let m_1 (m_2) be the number of horizontal (vertical) lines of G. For any given integer $0 \leq m \leq m_1 - 3$ ($m_2 - 3$) we denote by $\mathcal{R}^2_{1,m}(G)$ ($\mathcal{R}^2_{2,m}(G)$) the set of pairs of rectangles that lay in the strip of Ω between any two successive horizontal (vertical) lines of G and are separated by at most m rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(G)$.

Lemma 5. *Let* Ω *be a rectangle and let* u *be the solution to* (3) *with* $u_0 \in PCR(\Omega)$, $\lambda > 0$. *Let* G *be a grid such that* $\mathcal{Q}(u_0)$ *is subordinate to* G. *For* $i = 1, 2$ *there holds*

$$\max_{(R_1, R_2) \in \mathcal{R}^2_{i,m}(G)} |u|_{R_1} - u|_{R_2}| \leq \max_{(R_1, R_2) \in \mathcal{R}^2_{i,m}(G)} |u_0|_{R_1} - u_0|_{R_2}| \,. \tag{40}$$

Remark. Taking $m = 0$ in Lemma 5 we obtain that

$$\mathcal{H}^1\text{−ess} \max_{J_u} (u_+ - u_-) < \mathcal{H}^1\text{−ess} \max_{J_{u_0}} (u_{0,+} - u_{0,-}).$$

Proof. For a given $0 \leq k \leq m_i$ assume we have already proved that (40) holds for each $0 \leq m < k$. Take any pair of rectangles $(R_+, R_-) \in \mathcal{R}^2_{i,k}(G)$ that realizes the maximum in $|u|_{R_1} - u|_{R_2}|$. Let us take rectilinear polygons F_+, F_- in $Q(u)$ such that $R_\pm \subset F_\pm$.

Now, we assume that $i = 1$ (i. e. rectangles $R_\pm$ are in the same row of $\mathcal{R}(G)$), $u|_{R_+} > u|_{R_-}$ and R_- is to the left of R_+. Let us denote by x_- the maximal value of x coordinate of points in R_- and by x_+ the minimal value of x coordinate of points in R_+. Further, let us denote

- by J_0 the maximal interval such that $\{x_\pm\} \times J_0 \cap \partial R_\pm \neq \emptyset$ and $\{x_\pm\} \times J_0 \subset \partial F_\pm$,
- by $R_{\pm,0}$ minimal *rectangles* in $\mathcal{F}(G)$ that have $\{x_\pm\} \times J_0$ as one of their sides and contained $R_\pm$,



Figure 3: Map key for the notation in the proof of Lemma 5.

- by $R_{+,-1}$ (resp. $R_{-,-1}$) the minimal rectangle in $\mathcal{F}(G)$ that has $\{x_+\} \times J_0$ (resp. $\{x_-\} \times J_0$) as one of its sides and does not contain R_+ (resp. R_-),
- by K the number of endpoints of J_0 that do not intersect $\partial\Omega$ ($K \in \{0, 1, 2\}$),
- by $R_{\pm,j}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \leq K$ the K pairs of rectangles in $\mathcal{R}(G)$ such that
  - all of $R_{+,j}$, have a common side with $R_{+,0}$ and belong to the same column in $\mathcal{R}(G)$ as R_+,
  - all of $R_{-,j}$, have a common side with $R_{-,0}$ and belong to the same column in $\mathcal{R}(G)$ as R_-,
  - for a fixed j, both $R_{\pm,j}$ belong to the same row in $\mathcal{R}(G)$.

Due to the way these are defined, fixing $j \leq K$, at least one of the two rectangles $R_{\pm,j}$ is not contained in $F_+ \cup F_-$, and

$$\text{at least one of inequalities } u|_{R_{+,j}} < u|_{R_{+,0}},\ u|_{R_{-,j}} > u|_{R_{-,0}} \text{ hold.} \tag{41}$$

If there is a pair of rectangles $R'_\pm$ in $\mathcal{R}^2_{1,m}(G)$, $m < k$ such that $R'_\pm \subset F_\pm$ then we have already proved that

$$\left|u|_{R_+} - u|_{R_-}\right| = \left|u|_{R'_+} - u|_{R'_-}\right| \leq \max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathcal{R}^2_{i,k}} \left|u_0|_{R_1} - u_0|_{R_2}\right|.$$

Therefore, we can assume that

$$u|_{R_{+,-1}} < u|_{R_{+,0}} \text{ and } u|_{R_{-,-1}} > u|_{R_{-,0}} \text{ hold.} \tag{42}$$

We have

$$F_- \in \arg\min \mathcal{J}_{F_-,\partial F^+_-,\partial F^-_-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}} \quad \text{and} \quad F_+ \in \arg\max \check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_+,\partial F^+_+,\partial F^-_+,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}$$

(see the remark after the proof of Theorem 5). Therefore, taking into account (41, 42),

$$\begin{aligned} u|_{F_+} - u|_{F_-} &= -\lambda \left(\check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_+,\partial F_+^+,\partial F_+^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(F_+) - \mathcal{J}_{F_-,\partial F_-^+,\partial F_-^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(F_-) \right) \\ &\leq -\lambda \left(\check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_+,\partial F_+^+,\partial F_+^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(R_+) + \mathcal{J}_{F_-,\partial F_-^+,\partial F_-^-,\frac{u_0}{\lambda}}(R_-) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(R_+))} \int_{R_+} u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^2(R_-))} \int_{R_-} u_0 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^2 \leq \max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathcal{R}^2_{i,k}} |u_0|_{R_1} - u_0|_{R_2}| \,. \quad (43) \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 10. *Let Ω be a rectangle and let u be the solution to (3) with $u_0 \in C(\Omega)$, $\lambda > 0$. Then $u \in C(\Omega)$. In fact, if $\omega_1, \omega_2 \colon [0,\infty[\to [0,\infty[$ are continuous functions such that*

$$|u_0(x_1,x_2) - u_0(y_1,y_2)| \leq \omega_1(|x_1 - y_1|) + \omega_2(|x_2 - y_2|)$$

for each (x_1,x_2), (y_1,y_2) in Ω then we have

$$|u(x_1,x_2) - u(y_1,y_2)| \leq \omega_1(|x_1 - y_1|) + \omega_2(|x_2 - y_2|)$$

for each $t > 0$,(x_1,x_2), (y_1,y_2) in Ω.

Remark. Note that if ω is a concave modulus of continuity for u_0 with respect to norm $|\cdot|_1$, then ω_1, ω_2 defined by $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 10. On the other hand, given ω_1, ω_2 as in the Theorem, $\omega' = \omega_1 + \omega_2$ is a modulus of continuity for u_0 (as well as u).

Theorem 10 implies for instance that if L is the Lipschitz constant for u_0 with respect to norm $|\cdot|_1$, then the Lipschitz constant of u with respect to norm $|\cdot|_1$ is not greater than L.

Proof. We denote $\Omega = (s_1,s_2) + [0,l_1] \times [0,l_2]$. For $k = 1,2,\ldots$ let

$$G_k = \left(\left\{ s_1 + \frac{jl_1}{k}, j = 0,1,\ldots,k \right\} \times \mathbb{R} \right) \cup \left(\mathbb{R} \times \left\{ s_2 + \frac{jl_2}{k}, j = 0,1,\ldots,k \right\} \right)$$

and let $u_{0,k} \in PCR(\Omega)$ be defined by

$$u_{0,k}(\boldsymbol{x}) = u_0(\boldsymbol{x}_R) \quad \text{for } \boldsymbol{x} \in R \in \mathcal{R}(G_k),$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}_R$ is the center of R.

For any $k = 1,2,\ldots$, $i = 1,2$, $m = 0,\ldots,k-1$, let $(R,R') \in \mathcal{R}^2_{i,m}(G_k)$ with $(x_1,x_2) \in R, (y_1,y_2) \in R'$ we have

$$|u_{0,k}|_R - u_{0,k}|_{R'}| \leq \omega_i(|x_i - y_i| + \tfrac{1}{k}). \quad (44)$$

Let us denote by u_k the solution to (3) with datum $u_{0,k}$. Due to inequality (44) and Lemma 5 we have for any $(x_1,x_2),(y_1,y_2) \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u_k(x_1,x_2) - u_k(y_1,y_2)| &\leq |u_k(x_1,x_2) - u_k(y_1,x_2)| + |u_k(y_1,x_2) - u_k(y_1,y_2)| \\ &\leq \omega_1(|x_1 - y_1| + \tfrac{1}{k}) + \omega_2(|x_2 - y_2| + \tfrac{1}{k}). \end{aligned}$$

Now, due to monotonicity of $-\partial TV_{1,\Omega}$, we have $\|u_k - u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u_{0,k} - u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Therefore, there exists a set $N \subset \Omega$ of zero $\mathcal{L}^2$ measure and a subsequence (k_j) which we hereafter rename

(k) such that $u_{k_j}(\boldsymbol{x}) \to u(\boldsymbol{x})$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega \setminus N$. Now, for each pair $(x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2) \in \Omega$ take any pair of sequences $((x_{1,n}, x_{2,n})), ((y_{1,n}, y_{2,n})) \subset \Omega \setminus N$ such that $x_{i,n} \to x_i$ and $y_{i,n} \to y_i$. Passing to the limit $k \to \infty$ and then $n \to \infty$ in

$$|u_k(x_{1,n}, x_{2,n}) - u_k(y_{1,n}, y_{2,n})| \leq \omega_1(|x_{1,n} - y_{1,n}| + \tfrac{1}{k}) + \omega_2(|x_{2,n} - y_{2,n}| + \tfrac{1}{k})$$

we conclude the proof. □

Analogous results can be obtained for the solutions to (4).

Lemma 6. *Let Ω be a rectangle, let u be the solution to (4) with $u_0 \in PCR(\Omega)$ and let G be a grid such that $\mathcal{Q}(u_0, \Omega)$ is subordinate to G. Then for $i = 1, 2$ there holds*

$$\max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathcal{R}^2_{i,m}(G)} |u(t,\cdot)|_{R_1} - u(t,\cdot)|_{R_2}| \leq \max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathcal{R}^2_{i,m}} |u_0|_{R_1} - u_0|_{R_2}| \tag{45}$$

in any time instance $t > 0$.

Proof. The form of solution obtained in Theorem 7 implies that the function

$$t \mapsto \max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathcal{R}^2_{i,m}(G)} |u(t,\cdot)|_{R_1} - u(t,\cdot)|_{R_2}|$$

is piecewise linear and continuous, in particular it does not have jumps. Having this observation in mind, let us consider time instance $\tau > 0$ that does not belong to the set of merging times $\{t_1, \ldots, t_n\}$.

For a given $0 \leq k \leq m_i$ assume we have already proved that the slope of

$$t \mapsto \max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathcal{R}^2_{i,m}(G)} |u(t,\cdot)|_{R_1} - u(t,\cdot)|_{R_2}|$$

is non-positive in $t = \tau$ for each $0 \leq m < k$. Take any pair of rectangles $(R_+, R_-) \in \mathcal{R}^2_{i,k}(G)$ that realizes the maximum in $|u(t,\cdot)|_{R_1} - u(t,\cdot)|_{R_2}|$. Let us take rectilinear polygons F_+, F_- in $\mathcal{Q}(u(t,\cdot))$ such that $R_\pm \subset F_\pm$.

Then, reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u_t(\tau,\cdot)|_{F_+} - u_t(\tau,\cdot)|_{F_-} &= -\check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_+,\partial F_+^+,\partial F_+^-}(F_+) + \mathcal{J}_{F_-,\partial F_-^+,\partial F_-^-}(F_-) \\ &\leq -\check{\mathcal{J}}_{F_+,\partial F_+^+,\partial F_+^-}(R_+) + \mathcal{J}_{F_-,\partial F_-^+,\partial F_-^-}(R_-) \leq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

which concludes the proof. □

Now, note that if u and v are two solutions to (12) with $L^2(\Omega)$ initial data u_0 and v_0 respectively, we have for each time instance $t > 0$ (see [22], Theorem 11.)

$$\|u(t,\cdot) - v(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u_0 - v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Using this fact and Lemma 6, we can obtain the following analog of Theorem 10 for solutions of (12). The proof is almost identical and we omit it.

Theorem 11. *Let Ω be a rectangle and let u be the solution to* (12) *with initial datum $u_0 \in C(\Omega)$. Then $u(t,\cdot) \in C(\Omega)$ in every $t > 0$. In fact, if $\omega_1, \omega_2 \colon [0,\infty[\to [0,\infty[$ are continuous functions such that*

$$|u_0(x_1,x_2) - u_0(y_1,y_2)| \le \omega_1(|x_1 - y_1|) + \omega_2(|x_2 - y_2|)$$

for each (x_1,x_2), (y_1,y_2) in Ω then we have

$$|u(t,(x_1,x_2)) - u(t,(y_1,y_2))| \le \omega_1(|x_1 - y_1|) + \omega_2(|x_2 - y_2|)$$

for each $t > 0$,(x_1,x_2), (y_1,y_2) in Ω.

Finally, we note that all the results in this section carry over in a straightforward way to the case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$, provided that in the statements of Theorems 10 and 11 $C(\Omega)$ is replaced with $C_c(\mathbb{R}^2)$. On the other hand, if Ω is a rectilinear polygon different from a rectangle, the continuity is not necessarily preserved as Example 4 shows.

8 Examples

We start with the following general fact showing that minimizing (2) and solving (12) is equivalent in some cases.

Theorem 12. *Let Ω be a bounded domain or $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$ and let u be the strong solution to* (12) *in $[0,T[$ with initial datum $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. If there exists $\boldsymbol{z} \in L^\infty(]0,T[\times\Omega,\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying conditions (13-16) such that for some $0 < \lambda < T$ and almost all $0 < t < \lambda$*

$$\int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{z}(t,\cdot), Du(\lambda,\cdot)) = \int_\Omega |Du(\lambda,\cdot)|_\varphi. \tag{47}$$

Then the minimizer of (2) *with $\lambda > 0$ is given by $u_\lambda = u(\lambda,\cdot)$.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{z}_\lambda = \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_0^\lambda \boldsymbol{z}(t,\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}t$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{z}_\lambda \in X_\Omega(u_\lambda)$ satisfies $[\boldsymbol{z}_\lambda, \boldsymbol{\nu}^\Omega] = 0$ a. e. in $\partial\Omega$ and $|\boldsymbol{z}_\lambda|_\varphi^* \le 1$ a. e. in Ω. Furthermore, by virtue of (47),

$$\int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{z}_\lambda, Du_\lambda) = \int_\Omega |Du_\lambda|_\varphi, \tag{48}$$

so $\boldsymbol{z}_\lambda \in X_{\varphi,\Omega}(u_\lambda)$. Finally, (13) implies

$$u_\lambda - u_0 = \lambda \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{z}_\lambda \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega). \tag{49}$$

□

One class of solutions to (12) such that (47) holds, are PCR solutions constructed in Theorem (7) up to breaking time defined in the following

Definition 2. *Let u be the global strong solution to* (4) *with $u_0 \in PCR(\Omega)$ and let $0 < t_1 < \ldots t_n$, $\mathcal{Q}_0,\ldots,\mathcal{Q}_{n-1}$ and $\mathcal{S}_0,\ldots,\mathcal{S}_{n-1}$, $k = 0,\ldots,n-1$, be the sequences of time instances, partitions of Ω and consistent signatures obtained in the proof of Theorem 7. We call each of $t_1,\ldots,t_n$ a* merging time. *We say that t_i, $i = 1,\ldots,n$ is a* breaking time *if either $\mathcal{S}_{i-1}^+ \supsetneq \mathcal{S}_i^+$ or $\mathcal{S}_{i-1}^- \supsetneq \mathcal{S}_i^-$ holds.*

Indeed, the condition $\mathcal{S}^+_{i-1} \supseteq \mathcal{S}^+_i$ and $\mathcal{S}^-_{i-1} \supseteq \mathcal{S}^-_i$ holding for all $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ implies $\int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{z}_i, Du_\lambda) = \int_\Omega |Du_\lambda|_1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ (where $\boldsymbol{z}_0, \boldsymbol{z}_1, \dots \boldsymbol{z}_{k-1}$ are the vector fields obtained in the proof of Theorem 7) and consequently (47) is satisfied for $\lambda < t_k$.

Now we provide several examples illustrating the strength of our results. Note that even though they are formulated in the language of the flow, in all of them but the last one $]0, \lambda[\ni t \mapsto \boldsymbol{z}(t, \boldsymbol{x})$ is constant a. e. for $Du(\lambda, \cdot)$-almost every $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$ which implies (47), and therefore they are also solutions to (3).

First, let us present exact calculation for an example of the phenomenon of bending, which shows effectiveness of approximation with PCR functions.

Example 1. *Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$, $u_0 = \chi_{B_1(2)}$. We will show that the solution to (4) is given by*

$$u(t, \boldsymbol{x}) = (1 - v(\boldsymbol{x})t)_+,$$

with $v = \frac{1}{2-\sqrt{2}} \chi_{B_\infty(\sqrt{2}) \cap B_1(2)} + \frac{1}{2-|\boldsymbol{x}|_\infty} \chi_{B_1(2) \setminus B_\infty(\sqrt{2})}$.

In order to prove the claim, we approximate $B_1((0,0), 2)$ by a family of rectilinear polygons as follows. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define inductively

$$\begin{cases} A_{1,1} := B_\infty((0,0), 1) \\ A_{k,1} := B_\infty((\frac{k}{n}, 0), 1 - \frac{k}{n}) \setminus B_\infty((\frac{k-1}{n}, 0), 1 - \frac{k-1}{n}) \quad \text{for } k = 2, \dots, n \end{cases}.$$

We observe that $\bigcup_{k=1}^n A_{k,1}$ is an increasing sequence with respect to n and that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^n A_{k,1} = B_1((0,0), 2) \cap \{x_1 > 0, -1 \le x_2 \le 1\}.$$

By symmetry, we can construct $A_{k,2}$, $A_{k,3}$ and $A_{k,4}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^n A_{k,2} = B_1((0,0), 2) \cap \{x_2 > 0, -1 \le x_1 \le 1\},$$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^n A_{k,3} = B_1((0,0), 2) \cap \{x_1 < 0, -1 \le x_2 \le 1\},$$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^n A_{k,4} = B_1((0,0), 2) \cap \{x_2 < 0, -1 \le x_1 \le 1\}.$$

Therefore,

$$B_1((0,0), 2) = \lim_{n \to \infty} A_n := \bigcup_{k=1}^n \bigcup_{j=1}^4 A_{k,j}.$$

We let $C_k := \bigcup_{j=1}^4 A_{k,1}$, for $k = 1, \dots, n$. Observe that the inequality

$$\frac{P_1(C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_{k+1})}{|C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_{k+1})|} > \frac{P_1(C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_k)}{|C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_k)|}$$

holds (and therefore the facet C_{k+1} breaks from $C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_k$) if and only if the following inequality is satisfied:

$$\frac{1}{1 - \frac{k}{n}} > \frac{P_1(C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_k)}{|C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_k)|} = 2 \frac{1 + \frac{k-1}{n}}{1 + \frac{2(k-1)}{n}(1 - \frac{k}{2n})} \leftrightarrow \frac{k}{n} \ge \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{1}{2n}\right)^2 + 1} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2n}\right).$$

We now observe that, once C_{k+1} breaks from $C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_k$), so do C_j from C_{j-1} for $j = k+1, \ldots, n$ since the speed of each of the facets C_j is exactly given by $\frac{1}{1-\frac{j}{n}}$, which increases with respect to $j = k+1, \ldots, n$.

Therefore, the solution for $u_{0,n} = \chi_{A_n}$ is given by

$$u_n(t, \boldsymbol{x}) = \left(1 - \frac{P_1(C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_k)}{|C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_k)|} t\right)_+ \chi_{(C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_k)} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{1-\frac{j}{n}} t\right)_+ \chi_{C_j}, \tag{50}$$

with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$[k-1] < n \left(\sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{1}{2n}\right)^2 + 1} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2n}\right) \right) \leq [k].$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ in (50), we finish the proof.



(a) $t = 0$. (b) $t = 0.1$. (c) $t = 0.3$.

Figure 4: Plots of $u(t, \cdot)$ from Example 1 at certain time instances t.

Remark. Let us observe that the evolution of a bounded convex domain C satisfying an interior ball condition was explicitly given in [9, Section 8.3]. There, the authors defined a notion of anisotropic variational mean curvature, denoted by $H_C \colon \mathbb{R}^N \to]-\infty, 0]$, based on the solvability of some auxiliary minimizing problems and on the existence of a Cheeger set in C. Then, the solution to (12) with data $u_0 = \chi_C$ was given by

$$u(t, \boldsymbol{x}) = (1 + H_C(\boldsymbol{x})t)_+ \chi_C(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

In general, it is not obvious how to compute this anisotropic variational mean curvature. However, Example 1 shows that one can compute it by approximation of the set C with rectilinear polygons, even in the case that C does not satisfy the interior ball condition, as is the case in Example 1. Note that the solution starting with initial datum as in Example 1 was calculated with approximate numerical procedure in [23]. Here however we provide exact evolution in this case.

Example 2. *Theorem 7 predicts that the jump set of a function piecewise constant on rectangles may expand under the TV_1 flow, i. e.* facet breaking *may occur. Many explicit examples of this kind can be constructed. For instance, Figure 5 depicts function*

$$u(t, \cdot) = \left(1 - \tfrac{4}{3}t\right)_+ \chi_{B_\infty\left((0,0), \frac{3}{2}\right)} + (1 - 2t)_+ \chi_{B_\infty\left((2,0), \frac{1}{2}\right) \cup B_\infty\left((-2,0), \frac{1}{2}\right) \cup B_\infty\left((0,2), \frac{1}{2}\right) \cup B_\infty\left((0,-2), \frac{1}{2}\right)}$$

in $PCR_+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ that solves (4) with initial datum that is a characteristic function.



(a) $t = 0$. (b) $t = 0.08$. (c) $t = 0.24$.

Figure 5: Plots of $u(t, \cdot)$ from Example 2 in certain time instances t.



(a) $t = 0$. (b) $t = 0.08$. (c) $t = 0.24$.

Figure 6: Plots of $w(t, \cdot)$ from Example 3 in certain time instances t.



(a) $t = 0$. (b) $t = 0.08$. (c) $t = 0.24$.

Figure 7: Density plots of $z_1(t, \cdot)$ corresponding to $w(t, \cdot)$ from Example 3 in certain time instances t. Black corresponds to value 1, ivory to -1; note the value 0 outside the minimal strip containing the support of $w(t, \cdot)$.

Example 3. *On the other hand, Theorem 10 asserts that if u_0 is (Lipschitz) continuous, the solution u starting with u_0 is (Lipschitz) continuous in every time instance $t > 0$. For instance, if one extends the characteristic function form Example 2 continuously outside its support, no jumps will appear in the evolution — another manifestation of nonlocality of the equation.*

Here we present Figure 6, depicting evolution w of piecewise linear continuous function w_0 obtained by extending the initial datum from Example 2 outside its support up to 0 in such a way that $\nabla w_0 \in \{(0,0),(1,0),(0,1)\}$ $\mathcal{L}^2$-a. e. The evolution is obtained by explicit identification of corresponding field $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_1, z_2)$ under an ansatz that in each of a finite number of evolving regions either $z_i = \pm 1$ or a z_i is a linear interpolation of boundary values,

$i = 1, 2$ *(see Figure 7). This reduces the problem to a decoupled infinite system of ODEs. The evolution obtained this way is the strong solution starting with* w_0 *as it satisfies all the requirements in Definition 1. Figures 6 and 7 are obtained by solving numerically the system of ODEs using* Mathematica*'s* `NDSolve` *function. We omit the quite lengthy details.*

Example 4. *Next we provide an example showing that in non-convex rectilinear polygons (i. e. other than a rectangle) evolution starting with continuous initial datum may develop discontinuities. In the example*

$$\Omega = \{(x_1, x_2) \colon |(x_1, x_2)|_\infty \leq 1, x_1 \leq 0, x_2 \leq 0\}, \quad u_0(x_1, x_2) = x_2$$

and so $\nabla u(0, \cdot) \equiv (0, 1)$, $\boldsymbol{z}(0, \cdot) \equiv (0, 1)$. *The solution can be written explicitly, for* $t \leq \frac{1}{8}$ *we have*

$$u(t, x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} -1 + \sqrt{2t} & \text{if } x_2 \leq -1 + \sqrt{2t}, \\ -\sqrt{2t} & \text{if } x_1 \geq 0 \text{ and } x_2 \geq -\sqrt{2t}, \\ 1 - \sqrt{2t} & \text{if } x_1 < 0 \text{ and } x_2 \geq 1 - \sqrt{2t}, \\ x_2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We see that regions where $\nabla u = 0$ *appear near the boundary and expand with speed* $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2t}}$. *In these regions,* z_2 *is a linear interpolation between* 0 *and* 1. *Also a jump in the* x_2 *direction appears near* $\boldsymbol{x} = 0$ *and grows with the same speed.*



(a) $t = 0$. (b) $t = 0.04$. (c) $t = 0.12$.

Figure 8: Plots of $u(t, \cdot)$ from Example 4 at certain time instances t.



(a) $t = 0$. (b) $t = 0.04$. (c) $t = 0.12$.

Figure 9: Density plots of $z_2(t, \cdot)$ corresponding to $u(t, \cdot)$ from Example 4 in certain time instances t. Black corresponds to value 1, ivory to 0.

Example 5. *Finally, we give an example of datum $u_0 \in PCR_+(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for which the solutions u_λ to (3) and the solution u to (4) differ (for large enough t, equivalently λ). The datum is*

$$u_0 = 3\chi_{B_\infty\left((2,0),\frac{1}{2}\right)\cup B_\infty\left((-2,0),\frac{1}{2}\right)\cup B_\infty\left((0,2),\frac{1}{2}\right)\cup B_\infty\left((0,-2),\frac{1}{2}\right)} + \frac{5}{2}\chi_{B_\infty\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)}.$$

First the value of u on balls $B_\infty\left((\pm 2,0),\frac{1}{2}\right)$, $B_\infty\left((0,\pm 2),\frac{1}{2}\right)$ decreases with time faster than on $B_\infty\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)$ until a merging (and breaking) time $t_1 = \frac{9}{64}$ is attained and the solution continues as in Example 2. On the other hand, for $\lambda \le t_1$ we do have $u_\lambda = u(\lambda,\cdot)$, but for $t_1 < \lambda \le t_2 = \frac{3}{4}$

$$u_\lambda = \left(\tfrac{69}{26} - \tfrac{20}{13}\lambda\right)\chi_{B_\infty\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)\cup B_\infty\left((2,0),\frac{1}{2}\right)\cup B_\infty\left((-2,0),\frac{1}{2}\right)\cup B_\infty\left((0,2),\frac{1}{2}\right)\cup B_\infty\left((0,-2),\frac{1}{2}\right)}$$

and for $\lambda > t_2$

$$u_\lambda = (3-2\lambda)\chi_{B_\infty\left((2,0),\frac{1}{2}\right)\cup B_\infty\left((-2,0),\frac{1}{2}\right)\cup B_\infty\left((0,2),\frac{1}{2}\right)\cup B_\infty\left((0,-2),\frac{1}{2}\right)} + \left(\tfrac{5}{2} - \tfrac{5}{3}\lambda\right)\chi_{B_\infty\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)}.$$



(a) $t = 0$. (b) $t = 0.4$. (c) $t = 1.2$.

Figure 10: Plots of $u(t,\cdot)$ from Example 5 at certain time instances t.



(a) u_0. (b) $u_{0.4}$. (c) $u_{1.2}$.

Figure 11: Plots of u_λ from Example 5 for different values of λ.

9 Conclusions

The core of our results is the explicit construction of *tetris-like solutions*, i. e. solutions in the PCR class. This class can be viewed as a natural generalization of mono-dimensional step functions, whose finite dimensional structure allows to effectively reduce the original nonlinear problem. The directional diffusion allows to analyze the solutions only in a grid given by a

suitably chosen initial datum. We treat them as generic objects in the set of all weak solutions, hence PCR solutions are indeed smooth functions in the new analytical language exclusively dedicated to our variational problem. The detailed prescription of solutions allows to prove even conservation of moduli of continuity for continuous initial data. It, unexpected, removes this classical viewpoint on the issue of solvability out of our interests. Just information obtained for PCR functions is much more complete than any knowledge of regularity in the classical setting.

The special position of PCR functions motivates to consider many mathematical questions. Among them we find the issue of effective algorithm for finding Cheeger sets, for a more complex initial function this problem is nontrivial. In considerations in the present paper we use the fact that the structure of dynamics is always finite-dimensional, so the method is constructive. Indeed, we obtain explicit formulae for solutions. However from the point of view of possible applications, it would be useful to verify if there exists a faster, more efficient algorithm of determining speed of facets. The second problem we have in mind, is a multi-dimensional generalization. For that, we would need to modify the whole minimization procedure of the functional $\mathcal{J}$.

At the end we would like to say few words about the weakness of the approach. The procedure works due to the possibility of introducing a grid. It is the consequence of symmetry given by the $|\cdot|_1$ norm, the grid is just determined by directions $\hat{e}_{x_1}$, $\hat{e}_{x_2}$ for the initial datum. Here we have a natural shift symmetry, and the same structure at each vertex of the grid. It seems that it would be possible to attempt to repeat at least some of our analysis for anisotropic norms that generate tiling of the plane. Here we think of $|\cdot|_\phi$ determined by the hexagon, and tiling given by honeycomb structure. We are highly limited by regular tiling (triangular, rectangular and hexagonal), however it seems to be possible to introduce more complex structure for different anisotropy. Such problems will definitely require new framework not linked to the classical analysis.

Acknowledgements

The first named author has been supported by the grant no. 2014/13/N/ST1/02622 of the National Science Centre, Poland. The second author acknowledges partial support by the Spanish MEC and FEDER project MTM2015-70227-P.

The figures were prepared using Wolfram Mathematica 9.0.

References

[1] Micol Amar and Giovanni Bellettini. A notion of total variation depending on a metric with discontinuous coefficients. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 11(1):91–133, 1994.

[2] Gabriele Anzellotti. Pairings between measures and bounded functions and compensated compactness. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 135:293–318 (1984), 1983.

[3] Viorel Barbu. *Nonlinear differential equations of monotone types in Banach spaces.* Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2010.

[4] Giovanni Bellettini, Vicent Caselles, and Matteo Novaga. The total variation flow in $\mathbb{R}^N$. *J. Differential Equations*, 184(2):475–525, 2002.

[5] Giovanni Bellettini, Matteo Novaga, and Maurizio Paolini. On a crystalline variational problem. I. First variation and global L^∞ regularity. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 157(3):165–191, 2001.

[6] Giovanni Bellettini, Matteo Novaga, and Maurizio Paolini. On a crystalline variational problem. II. BV regularity and structure of minimizers on facets. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 157(3):193–217, 2001.

[7] Benjamin Berkels, Martin Burger, Marc Droske, Oliver Nemitz, and Martin Rumpf. Cartoon extraction based on anisotropic image classification vision, modeling, and visualization. In *Vision, Modeling, and Visualization 2006: Proceedings, November 22-24, 2006, Aachen, Germany*, page 293. IOS Press, 2006.

[8] E. Casas, K. Kunisch, and C. Pola. Regularization by functions of bounded variation and applications to image enhancement. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 40(2):229–257, 1999.

[9] V. Caselles, A. Chambolle, S. Moll, and M. Novaga. A characterization of convex calibrable sets in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with respect to anisotropic norms. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 25(4):803–832, 2008.

[10] Vicent Caselles, Antonin Chambolle, and Matteo Novaga. The discontinuity set of solutions of the TV denoising problem and some extensions. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 6(3):879–894, 2007.

[11] Vicent Caselles, Antonin Chambolle, and Matteo Novaga. Regularity for solutions of the total variation denoising problem. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 27(1):233–252, 2011.

[12] R. H. Chan, S. Setzer, and G. Steidl. Inpainting by flexible Haar-wavelet shrinkage. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 1(3):273–293, 2008.

[13] Gui-Qiang Chen and Hermano Frid. Divergence-measure fields and hyperbolic conservation laws. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 147(2):89–118, 1999.

[14] Huasong Chen, Chunyong Wang, Yang Song, and Zhenhua Li. Split bregmanized anisotropic total variation model for image deblurring. *Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation*, 31:282 – 293, 2015.

[15] Rustum Choksi, Yves van Gennip, and Adam Oberman. Anisotropic total variation regularized L^1 approximation and denoising/deblurring of 2D bar codes. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 5(3):591–617, 2011.

[16] Selim Esedoḡlu and Stanley J. Osher. Decomposition of images by the anisotropic Rudin-Osher-Fatemi model. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 57(12):1609–1626, 2004.

[17] B. G. Fitzpatrick and S. L. Keeling. On approximation in total variation penalization for image reconstruction and inverse problems. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.*, 18(9-10):941–958, 1997.

[18] Enrico Giusti. *Minimal surfaces and functions of bounded variation*, volume 80 of *Monographs in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1984.

[19] Tom Goldstein and Stanley Osher. The split Bregman method for $L1$-regularized problems. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 2(2):323–343, 2009.

[20] Markus Grasmair and Frank Lenzen. Anisotropic total variation filtering. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 62(3):323–339, 2010.

[21] G. Mercier. Continuity results for tv-minimizers. *Preprint, arXiv:1605.09655*, 2016.

[22] Salvador Moll. The anisotropic total variation flow. *Math. Ann.*, 332(1):177–218, 2005.

[23] Piotr B. Mucha, Monika Muszkieta, and Piotr Rybka. Two cases of squares evolving by anisotropic diffusion. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 20(7-8):773–800, 2015.

[24] Leonid I. Rudin, Stanley Osher, and Emad Fatemi. Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms. *Phys. D*, 60(1-4):259–268, 1992. Experimental mathematics: computational issues in nonlinear science (Los Alamos, NM, 1991).

[25] S. Setzer, G. Steidl, and T. Teuber. Restoration of images with rotated shapes. *Numer. Algorithms*, 48(1-3):49–66, 2008.